

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1898.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER.

BY PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D. D.

The obligations and qualifications of the Christian minister are manifold, and cannot be too strongly emphasized. The pulpit will never become obsolete. While human nature remains the same, and sin is sin, and the Gospel continues to be the power of God unto salvation, there will always be a place for the herald of pardon and hope. What the flower is to the plant, the ministry is to the Church. It is the measure of the Church's life, and the secret of the growth and perpetuity of that life. Its importance and efficiency in any land or age depend largely upon its ability to adapt and apply saving truth to the needs and ever changing conditions of mankind.

Ministers are still in demand. There is not an over-production within the Lutheran gates. And there is no surplus of the right kind within any gates. If all our available men were employed, there would yet be, according to the most recent and reliable statistics, two per cent. of our charges pastorless, and no reserve force with which to meet the new and urgent calls for extension. The great denominations of Christendom had their origin in a revival of the preaching of the Word. The command of our Lord was, "Go *preach* my Gospel." The Apostles obeyed it and *preached*. The great reformers in all ages have obeyed it. In seasons of awakened interest men obey the command of Christ and *preach* it. Whenever and wherever the power of Christianity has been dominant, preaching has come

to the front. It is by the "foolishness of preaching" that the world is to be saved. There is a charm, and impressiveness in the human voice, as it narrates its own heart's experience, which nothing will ever be able to supplant. We cannot, therefore, insist upon too high a standard of character and equipment.

I. The first condition of efficiency on the part of the true minister is, that *he know his Bible*. This is his chief text book. Whatever else he may be ignorant of, he should be familiar with this. Here are the fields which he must explore—depths which he must fathom, heights which he must ascend. If he wishes to lead others to Christ, he should know the path to the King's high way. Give me as a guide over a dangerous road, or through a dense forest, one who has often threaded the winding way and is familiar with its perils. The minister should be master of the books of the Bible as they appear in their completeness on the sacred pages. He should also know the Bible as the word of God, the one complete, consistent revelation of God's plan of redemption for a lost world. It is not enough that he should study all about the Bible, all around the Bible, but he should study the Bible itself, as one great and comprehensive thought of God. He should study it and grasp it as a whole, in relation to its great center. He should master it in its every book, until every book is understood in itself and in its relation to the whole Bible. He should study it throughout grammatically, logically, prayerfully, by the help of the Holy Spirit, until it becomes a living book, quick and powerful in all its range of revealed truth and fact.

Such study will help the minister more in his work of answering objections than all his knowledge of science, and of human investigations and speculations. In truth, to most of the objections brought against it and its religion, the Bible is its own best answer. When the light shines the darkness will be dispelled. Only a few years ago one of the greatest preachers of the whole world passed away. For almost half a century he had crowded audiences and thousands who had never seen his face or heard his voice, read with profit the products of his pen. What was the secret of Mr. Spurgeon's success? I judge that

it was his remarkable familiarity with the Word of God and his wonderful mastery of its truth.

It was this knowledge of the Word of God and his loyalty to it that made Martin Luther the greatest preacher of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. Men filled the aisles and pulpit altar to listen to his message, for they felt and believed it came from God's Word. His supreme aim was to help his hearers to see the Word of God as it is in itself. When he succeeded in doing that, he trusted God to take care of the ordinary objections, and to make the Word by his Holy Spirit a saving power. Doubtless one of the reasons for the cry of the age against theology is, that the preachers and the people have had so little living theology from the Bible. That is a suggestive statement made by an eminent American lecturer, that he takes his illustrations from the Bible, because they are new to most audiences.

The attempt in some theological seminaries to get in everything but the Bible, has not proven beneficial. The result is that the minister, in his training period, fails to get such a grasp of this greatest of sciences as will give it an interest to himself; and so he must of course fail of the ability to infuse into it any interest for its hearers. No wonder men cry out against "dry theology," and insist that they want no more of it. It is the lack of genuine theology that is the matter with much of the preaching, and against which the people protest, and against which they are right in protesting.

The minister of to-day needs especially a living system of theology. The people are hungry for the true bread, and they like it well baked, not raw dough. They want to inhale the odor of it when it comes warm and fresh from an oven heated by the fires of earnestness and faithful study. They starve on conjectural criticism. They need strong and generous feeding, not flogging. When a minister fails to supply nourishing diet, the liabilities greater than the assets, and loses his grip on God's Word, and the people lose their grip on the Word also, there is danger of a spiritual death from heart failure. But where the people are well fed, and there is a prepared pulpit, the pews fill

up, and the people fill up. Our churches need an enlarged and deeper experience and knowledge of the Word rather than an increased membership.

II. The Christian minister must be *positive*. Mainly concerned in the teaching of truth, rather than the refutation of error. The best way to expel error is to occupy its place with truth. He must have a sincere conviction of that which he preaches. He must believe it. We have fallen upon days when there is a disposition to admire *doubt*, as though it were a sign of superior cleverness to be sceptical. But no man is a preacher of power who can not say, "I *know* whom I have believed," and what I believe. All uncertainty here is a fatal defect. Empirical preaching is that which carries with it power from on high. The sceptic will honor such and exclaim, "That's the man for me; he speaks as if Jesus Christ were at his elbow." Such preaching no scholarship nor oratory can assure. Nothing but a deep experience of God can make the highest sort of preacher.

Christianity's greatest peril grows out of its own bosom; this danger consists in the slow and gradual neglect of the faith in the facts which have caused its birth and sustained it, that faith which alone can perpetuate it. It is not persecution which threatens the Church to-day, but suicide. A positive preaching will secure positive results. Not that preaching which simply draws a crowd, or which simply draws to itself human praise, or which simply draws wealth and fashion, or which simply draws tears by arousing deep feeling and stirring the emotions. If these are the limits of its effectiveness there will be disappointment. By positive and effective preaching we understand that preaching which draws men to Christ, and which builds them up in Christ, which makes bad men good, and good men better, which edifies, or builds up the Church, which does, indeed, arouse deep feeling and stirs the emotions, but which does it as a means to an end. And it so does it that when feelings and emotions have passed away like the morning dew, as they surely will, there shall be left a substantial basis for an earnest and abiding purpose to live a better

life. There is need that the trivial and petulant temper of the time be met with sincere and thorough restatement of the fundamental doctrines of grace. Shallow plowing leaves old weeds. The sub-soil plow of conviction and repentance still needs to be put in up to the beam. This may be a day of telegrams, steam and electricity and we may move rapidly in thought and transportation, but human nature is not yet sanctified and needs the application of the Gospel in a positive manner.

One reason why there are so few men, comparatively, in attendance upon the ministrations of not a few pulpits is, that there is a marked lack of true manliness in the preaching, for it is a fact that there is a good deal of the jelly fish composition in a very large number of pulpits in the land. Manly men of the world, even though they try hard to remain unbelievers of the Gospel, in a practical sort of a way admire manliness in the pulpit. Bishop Phillips Brooks was preëminently a manly preacher, and drew a very large number of strong men to his ministry. When he preached at midday in New York it was stated that brainy, hard-headed business men and many others of mental ability, in very large numbers heard him with eagerness. The pulpit of to-day needs a man in it.

III. The Christian minister must *make progress*. There is a reasonable and just demand on the part of the Church for vigor of manhood, mental acuteness and enterprise, in those who claim the leading places as the molders of society. Other men are every where awake and alive, full of activity and research, in science, in philosophy, in business and in pleasure hunting—there is no time for the man in the pulpit to sleep. He needs to keep abreast of the age, if he is to hold his place. Continuous and progressive efficiency in the ministry requires continuous growth of powers and of resources, and requires them, because of his exposure to an almost omniscient and a merciless scrutiny. The apartments of no man's soul are so completely laid open to the public gaze as are his. Whoever will, may take an inventory of their furnishings. Every sermon mirrors them. Every act is a window through which they may be seen. The gauge of no other man in the community is, on the whole, so

correctly taken. The intellectual and spiritual poverty of no one is so quickly detected, and the riches of none are so gladly recognized and so loyally appreciated. But the moment one is seen to have exhausted his little store, and to be making no new acquisitions, the moment it is known that he has no mental and moral reserves, his usefulness is largely gone. No one can hold the attention or command the respect of a people to-day who cannot instruct them, who is not in this special line of knowledge, in advance of them, and is not every day taking in more rapidly than he is giving out. The larger his growth, if it be symmetrical, the more efficient will he become. It would add immensely to their power if all ministers could rise to higher aims at development of all their capabilities, and at enlargement of their resources by gathering from every open field of knowledge. Wide awake men have no patience to-day with the fighting of dead enemies. Life is too short. There are living foes to take up our time and strength. There are giants opposing us in the present. Forgetting the past the minister must move on to that which is beyond. He is living in the nineteenth century, and near the close of that. He must be a student of the times, must know what men are thinking about. He must acquaint himself with the social problems of the day, so that if any of those problems are vexing his hearers he may be able to help solve them. Sociology and theology have vital and inseparable relation. The one is the science of social well-being; the other of spiritual well-being. The second commandment is as important as the first. We must give attention to men's environments as well as to them as individuals.

The minister has the best opportunity to study social conditions. He goes among all men. All doors are opened to him, if he has the spirit of ministry to all. Nothing can be more wholesome for him than to study men as the botanist the flower, and the geologist the rock. It will keep him from speculative theories and hysterical reforms, and give his service both directness and adaptedness. He can make a true diagnosis of conditions and needs; for he goes as no curious experimenter, but with the cheer and confidence of the sovereign remedy. The

minister should never stand in his place, deaf and dumb to the questions and movements that are forming the life of the generation. We want no new gospel, but a right and practical application of the one already given to the ever-changing requirements of the Church and the world.

There are good men who need direction as well as bad men who need correction. There are earnest and good men who are not conscious believers. There is a large true church outside the denominations. They are scared at our doctrinal requirements; they are offended at our want of practicality; they are in a false position where, alas, we have helped to place them. The minister is to be that brave, broad soul that can understand their mistaken attitude, and bring into the army of Christ those who under doubtful misapprehension sometimes fight on the other side.

IV. The Christian minister should be *well equipped*. In view of what has been said, it seems to me as clear as sunlight that thorough preparation is demanded by the spirit of the age and the genius of our holy religion. I do think that our young men called of God to preach the Gospel should enjoy the best facilities for improvement that our seminaries can afford. Long and laborious preparation is required in almost every other department of human effort. In mechanism several years apprenticeship is a necessary condition of respectability and success. If preparation for any given work is essential in proportion to the value of the interests at stake, then the ministry assumes unusual importance, for its responsibilities exceed the power of human conception. Other things being equal, the best educated in all the pursuits of life succeed the best. It is trifling with deathless hopes to intrust such responsibilities to the care of the ignorant and inexperienced. If the sculptor must spend years in preparing to infuse life into the chiseled marble, and clothe with intelligence the semblance of human lineaments; if the painter lingers long upon the nature and blending of colors, that he may transfer to canvas the breathing expression of life; ought not the minister, whose mission is the salvation of the immortal soul—the most responsible calling in

the universe—have extensive and peculiar preparation, when a mistake may involve consequences so appalling?

The literary qualifications requisite for the ministry cannot be acquired by supernatural agency, but by hard study. The grace of God quickens our dormant powers, purifies and strengthens the mind, but it furnishes no such supernatural aid as to preclude the necessity of faithful study. The minister's mind is no widow's cruse that fills up with scriptural truth as rapidly as it is emptied; this must be done by the slow and laborious process of hard study, careful observation, prayerful meditation, and profound thought. The lawyer naturally asks whether a man who has the spiritual estate of men to deal with ought not to be as industrious and as well equipped as one who has to deal only with their temporal estates. The physician naturally asks whether the man who has the cure of souls ought to be less strictly engaged and furnished than he who has only the cure of bodies. These men of mental and bodily labor reasonably despise an idler or ignoramus in any department, particularly in a calling the most pressing and important.

The ministry is no place for the man of elegant leisure, for the laggard or the sluggard, or for any man who is not prepared under God to do as Paul enjoins, "spend and be spent" in the service, and to be as he was, "in labors more abundant, in weariness and painfulness, in watching often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." This however, must be said after all: that there is no calling on earth in which it is better to wear out by hard work, than in that of the Christian ministry. Magnify its toils and difficulties as we may, it is the best service to which a man can give his hand, and heart, and head.

To fulfill the work of this calling successfully, we need all of preparation, all of culture, but we need something more. The source of power is in the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The apostles knew all the facts of the gospels, all the doctrines of Christ, when their Lord ascended; but they were not qualified to preach, did not preach, dared not preach, were forbidden to preach, until the Spirit gave them utterance. Paul's culture did

not make him a minister, but after God made him a Christian, his culture made his ministry effective. We need for the instruction of the minister all treasures of knowledge, but they must be brought to the font and baptized into Christianity. We need to understand the secret of this old power. All of our engines and appliances for a spiritual work and warfare will be utterly useless, unless and until filled with the fire and energy of the Holy Ghost. We may have the presence of this power with us. The measure of our possession of the Holy Ghost is exactly equal to our readiness to receive him.

Given this firmer grip of the Bible with its glorious living theology and practical life, this positive and manly exhibition of divine truth, this better intellectual and sociological equipment, this endowment of the Spirit, and we have the means suited, rationally and scripturally, for bringing the world to heed the Gospel.

ARTICLE II.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AT THE END OF THE CENTURY.

BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, A. M.

The end of the century finds the varied votaries of politics, science, art and literature recording the gains and losses of their respective vocations. We have presented *fin de siècle* colonial policies, the Victorian strides of biology and surgery, the impressionist and symbolist in art, and the decadent and realist in literature—all shouting their varied advances and shibboleths. The end of the century finds human thought and activity in a different temper and position than at the opening of the last hundred years. It is small wonder then, that thoughtful men are seeking to measure and state the missionary advance and situation at the end of the century. Practically, this century covers the whole period of Protestant missionary activity. As we come to reckon the expenditures of money, time, wealth and lives, one is forced to ask "to what end was all this human sacrifice." Can we press the Church to repeat, yes, quadruple her

gifts in the coming century? Do the results justify our exaltation of foreign missions, and the reiterated appeals for larger investments of money and men? It is true, something of the early heroism has departed from present day work in the foreign field. Missions move on, now, as a siege rather than as a daring attack upon a bristling fort. It is also true that they are still being severely criticised respecting their methods and results. The luxurious and hasty travelers from the artistic and commercial centers of the West do not find themselves in accord with the missionaries' code of morals and ideals. It is true that some of the Church's representatives have attempted to force Occidentalism, rather than Christianity, upon their converts. It is patent also that the mere numerical results do not seem commensurate with the output of dollars and energy and faith. We admit also that the time is drawing near when the work, in some places, must be handed over to the native church. We do not desire to ignore the national peculiarity and method of adapting Christianity to the needs of Japan or China. A native church is stronger than a foreign church, when the native church holds the truth as given by Christ and Apostle. These changed conditions have chilled the enthusiasm of some. Others discovering, for the first time, that the more advanced nations of the East have a civilization and a religion, in many cases, of high ethical and philosophical claim, have hesitated about impressing our youthful Christianity upon their hoary faiths. Can we, then, on the threshold of the twentieth century move forward with the old time assurance, and enthusiasm? Do Christian missions at the end of the century, warrant us in making the old, stupendous claims for our faith? In reply to such inquiry I would say:

I.

The end of the century finds us reassured that Christianity is the one absolute religion for all the world.

Our first studies in comparative religion aroused the thought that, perhaps, the great ethnic religions of the East were sufficient faiths for their respective peoples. The exaggerated claims made by certain leaders of modern pagan thought tended to sap

the enthusiasm of many who were not acquainted, at first hand, with the sacred books and practical morality of Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism and Confucianism.

Confucianism does present a beautiful and effective filialism for our emulation. The devotion of child to parent inculcated by Confucius, and actualized in China, is an impressive and helpful social and national power. True, their reverence for parents becomes idolatry, and mars the spirituality of the Chinese nation, but, when we consider the flippant disregard of paternal honor and rights in America, we may well turn to China for a lesson in filialism.

Buddhism does present a winsome humanism as the ethical and religious goal of man. Its subversion of tyrannical, social and religious castes, its concentration of the mind upon the spiritual life, and its gospel of pity for the poor and wretched everywhere, relates it very closely, on the moral side, to him "who went about doing good."

The revived Hinduism of our day does declare a theism distinct and clear, as compared with the atheism and pantheism of Confucianism and Buddhism. From the purely philosophic standpoint, it is a great satisfaction to learn of this monotheistic revival among the savages of India. The recovery of the early Vedas has aroused a longing among the better classes in India for the ancient faith in the one creative and beneficent God of their fathers.

Mohammedan monotheism is a commanding belief so closely allied to Judaistic theology that had not the ruthless military crusade of Mohammedanism bred an intolerant, despotic amalgam of Church and State it would have been a mighty religious force for the uplifting of the barbarous tribes of Arabia and Africa. Its constant testimony to the one creator of the universe is an incalculable help in the winning of the Dark Continent to the fuller light and life of Christianity.

But when we have said so much for the great ethnic faiths we have said all in their favor that an unbiased critic can say. On fuller comparative study, when viewed in the light of the demands of a rational philosophy, and the best ethics, the insuffi-

ciency and positive corruption of each ethnic faith becomes evident.

Confucianism does not attempt to answer the eternal questions: "From whence, what, whither." The problems of creation, sin, and futurity it declares are beyond its ken, and urges a sane utilitarianism as the wisest attitude to sustain toward these great mysteries of life. Sin, as sin, has no place in its conception of man. Irreverence for parents and the state are the supreme crimes. Neither in its philosophy or ethics can it satisfy the Christian-bred thinker and moralist. Buddhism looses both God and morals in a pantheistic maze. Its God is impersonal, and so thoroughly identified with humanity, that its immoral action is but a part of the expression of the creative world power, which we understand as God. Practically it has no theology and no consistent theory of morals. It is thoroughly pessimistic. Life here, and hereafter, is a thing to be escaped, and the end of all religious development is absorption into the serene nothingness of an unconscious All.

Hindu theism is so nebulous that it results in a practical polytheism. It offers no salvation to humanity—save the philosophic belief in a God, and love for this super-rational power. It lacks the grappling hooks of redemption, and recalls a Concord Summer School of Philosophy, rather than an active propaganda for the salvation of lost men. The exotics in Hindu beliefs recently presented to American audiences by Vivekananda and his fellow religionists, is a mass of physiological and psychological nonsense. Let any trained student of body and mind read his "Raga-Yogi," and all his esoteric spiritualism becomes religious moonshine in the light of the established science and philosophy of our nineteenth century.

Mohammedan monotheism is abortive for two reasons. It does not present a heavenly father, but an inexorable autocrat, as the centre of its religious system. And its moral code becomes a practical fatalism by reason of its theology. In the light of our Christian faith and character it is seen as the arrested development of a great thought. Christ, not Mohammed was the true fulfiller of Jewish type and prophecy. Des-

torting this fact, all the crudities of his personal thought and character were engrafted on the faith of Moses, with the result of a stunted and cruel faith dominating a naturally peaceful, independent people.

But it is asked: "Can there not be some eclectic religion fashioned for these peoples, a religion which will have Christianity at the summit of the pyramid, yet utilizing the best in the ethnic faiths, in order to attract and hold those outside the Christian pale?" I would answer, first, that religions can not be manufactured; they are organic in their structure and growth. They root themselves in the temper, needs and history of a nation. They start from historic facts and grow from a deeper principle than aggregation. We recall the answer of Talleyrand to the group of humanists who came, after the revolutionists of Paris had enthroned a harlot in Notre Dame as the goddess of reason, bringing a closet-made scheme of religious faith and worship: "Yes, yes, gentlemen, this is all very fine on paper, but when you can get one of your number to die for this faith, and rise again the third day, you may be able to get the people to accept it."

My second reply to such a question would be, whatever of value we find in the great ethnic faiths Christianity already possesses and combines in a higher and in an absolute way.

No other faith approaches in fulness, majesty and tenderness the Christian conception of God. He is the self-existent, conscious, all powerful Creator of the world. He is the all-wise and constant Preserver of the universe. He is the one holy Judge of all peoples, into whose life his redeemed children shall come, at last, to perfect strength and joy. Compared with the Christian view of God and the world, the theism of paganism becomes pitifully nebulous and futile.

Christianity offers a positive revelation of God's being and will in the Incarnation of his Son, begotten and loved from all eternity. This God-man, Jesus Christ, comes as the world's Saviour from sin. He is no tribal redeemer, but a universal Saviour for a sinful, guilty humanity. He comes not to crush life, but to give us a richer, complete life. From sinfulness to sonship with God, that is the movement of his kingdom in the heart of

men. He furnishes not only the ideal for humanity but also "the power of God unto salvation." What has the ethnic faiths to offer in comparison to Jesus Christ—as ideal man and divine Saviour?

Christianity declares with no uncertain voice what social life should be here, and declares the endless blessing and the endless curse after this life. It dignifies our present conception of man by the declaration of the immortality of the soul. It promises fulness of life as the goal of the Christian race, and declares that searching, retributive, punishments await the rebellious and sinful children of God in the great hereafter. The future, as the present, is to be one of self-consciousness raised to its highest power.

What has a vapid Buddhism or Hinduism to match with this impressive and sublime view of the man? A comparative study of the ethnic faiths, made in the light of a rational philosophy and satisfactory ethics, at once reveals the partialness and crudity of pagan faiths, and enthrones Christianity as the one absolute religion for the world. Says Sir M. Monier-Williams: "I have said enough to put you on your guard when you hear people speak too highly of the sacred books of the East, other than our own Bible. Let us not shut our eyes to what is excellent and true and of good report in these books; but let us teach Hindus, Zoroastrians, Confucianists, Buddhists, and Mohammedans that there is only one sacred Book that can be their mainstay, their support, in that awful hour when they pass alone into the unseen world. There is only one book to be clasped to the heart—only one Gospel that gives peace to the fainting soul then. It is the sacred volume which contains that faithful saying worthy to be accepted of all men, women, and children, in the East and in the West, in the North and in the South, 'that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.'"

The ethnic religions of the East are not the only critics to be answered. In the warfare of science with theology, there have been those too ready to declare the defeat or discomfiture of theology. They have declared that Christianity, though the superior of all other religions, has no real or abiding message for

the future. That her dogma has evaporated into poetry, and her facts into a bare idealism. If all this were so, then indeed the nerve of missionary activity would be cut forever. But as long as a man of the supreme scientific standing of the late George John Romanes boldly declares his belief in the imperishable elements of Christian faith, we need fear no effective contradiction from the scientific world. In his *Thoughts on Religion*, Romanes says: "One of the strongest pieces of objective evidence in favor of Christianity is not sufficiently enforced by apologists. * * It is the absence from the biography of Christ of any doctrines which the subsequent growth of human knowledge—whether in natural science, ethics, political economy, or elsewhere—has had to discount." This testimony is the most striking contribution to Christian apologetics made during the decade. From the purely scientific stand-point, Romanes stands in the same place with Huxley, Tyndall, Kelvin, Morgan and Cope. His words are an indication of the more sympathetic attitude of modern men of science towards the fundamental dogmas of Christianity. Backed by such testimony the missionary of to-day is reënforced, if any such need exists, for his confident advance into the centres of Eastern culture and agnosticism, assured that there is no proven positions in science to destroy the truth and force of the Christian view of the world and man. On the basis of the "survival of the fittest," Christianity is bound to win.

II.

Our second answer to the question is, that the end of the century clearly demonstrates Christian missions to be the most influential factor in modern civilization.

Rome had a civilization. In some features, especially in the formulation and administration of law, she stood high on the scale of culture. But who would seek to recall even the Augustana era, and establish its code of political, ethical and religious life in America? The economic and political authorities that crushed the independent, provincial life of Rome's staunchest citizenship, coupled with her enervating customs and man-

ners, were the main causes of her decline. Both of these aberrations had their rise in corrupt hearts. Rome had no sufficient moral force to conserve her civilization.

China has a civilization. One of the surprises of the traveler in the far East is to find a vast, complex, persistent civilization which has existed thousands of years. Arts and manufacturing interests, schools and laws, literature and religion, armies and civil servants, abound on all sides. China claims the oldest extant civilization. But what of it? Compared to England and America it is a clear case of arrested development, or something worse. Who would care to repeat it in the United States?

The truth is, that only where the transforming touch of an Evangelical Christianity has been felt, do we find the highest types of modern civilization. This claim has been and is still denied. The one-eyed political economist finds the heart of progress in the adoption of the mechanical and financial devices of the most advanced nations. The secret, he says, of civilization's advance is the wider and more equable distribution of national wealth.

The secularistic statesman urges an enlarging sphere of liberty, and the judicial administration of law, as the most needed reforms in the march of civilization.

The agnostic educator declares a broader education for all classes as the heart of civilization's advance.

That each and all of these developments are sorely needed no sane citizen will deny, but they are only the secondary expressions of a much deeper principle of reform. They all rest upon the creation of a keener and a fuller sense of brotherhood—a Christian brotherhood which will extend and share with each and all the blessings of wealth, liberty and education. The most profound students of sociology, though recognizing the immense part played by a sound economy, rightful freedom, and a wise education in secular studies, find the religious instincts and beliefs of a people the deepest and most potent factor in their civilization. Mr. Benjamin Kidd's main contention is unanswerable, *i. e.* that for the enforcement of social duties, every people have had some sort of supernatural sanction above and

commanding their actions. Egypt, Babylon, Greece, Rome, Israel down to American Indian and Zulu, have had their ethics inextricably united with their religious conceptions. A people's morals and theology move upward, or downward, together. Even Mr. Herbert Spencer has declared that the "anti-theological" bias has caused many anthropologists and historians to fall into error in the interpretation of social evolution. "Ignoring the truth for which religions stand," he says, "it (this bias) undervalues religious institutions in the past, thinks they are useless in the present, and expects they will leave no representatives in the future." It is one of the signs of the times that all sociologists of weight have of necessity to treat the question of religion as one of the abiding dynamic forces in the progress of society. There is an unalterable law of progress and decay *i. e.* that when the material forces of society triumph over the moral and ideal, that epoch marks the arrest and decline of a civilization. Prof. Nash in his study—"The Genesis of the Social Conscience," clearly demonstrates that all the contributions made by Greece and Rome to a healthful altruism were insignificant, compared with the ideal and condition created by Christianity. Christ, both in his conception of "The Kingdom of God," and in the regenerating spiritual power given, furnished the only genuine ideal and dynamic of civilization. This claim is not a mere matter of philosophical reasoning, but rests on evident facts, facts that confront us at the close of nineteenth century history. It would be impossible in a paper written for a review to present a full, or even partial, series of historic illustrations of our claim. The one book which has taken its place as a classic on the sociological effect of Christianity upon pagan, national and social life, is Dr. Dennis' "Christian Missions and Social Progress." Mr. Edwin Hodder's "The Conquests of the Cross," the concise summaries of Dr. Bliss in his "History of Missions," the scores of missionary reports of the London and other missionary societies, together with the multitudinous biographies of unbiased travelers and resident governors of foreign colonies, all furnish us with the material for our study of the social advance stimulated

and guided by Christian missionaries and Christian literature. The work of Father Damien in Molokai's leper colony, the mitigation of war horrors, the gradual liberation of women in India, the banishment of child sacrifice, the recent testimony of Julian Hawthorne to the fidelity of the missionaries in India's famine, as compared with the Hindu merchant's indifference in the midst of the staggering skeletons about the well-filled grain baskets, the marvelous change made by the introduction of Christian medical missions in China, the enlarging sphere of liberty which Christianity always breeds in a people, the new conceptions of truth and purity which dominate a nation accepting Christianity's moral code, the aroused love of study and respect for law inculcated, are but a few reforms which could be illustrated indefinitely, had we the space at our disposal. Even in Turkey, that most obstinate of missionary fields, Prof. Ramsey, of Aberdeen University, who has spent twelve years in archaeological study in that country, speaks of the great educational organization which the American missionaries have built up in Turkey with admirable foresight and skill, and adds: "Beginning with a prejudice against their work, I was driven by force of facts and experience to the opinion that the mission has been the strongest, as well as most beneficent, influence in causing the movement toward civilization which has been perceptible among all the peoples of Turkey." That Jesus had a distinctly social, as well as an individual regeneration in mind, no student of New Testament literature can fail to see. Mr. Shaler Matthews has collected, and systematized, in his "Social Teachings of Jesus," all the principles and precepts of Christ which pertain to the domestic, political and social duties of life. We might call it a specific, social ethics—a book which finds its illustration in every society which has fully adopted the Christian law of love as its guide in life.

Already attempts have been made to secure the social fruit of Christianity without the acceptance of Jesus Christ as an individual and social saviour. Japan, seemingly, wants the kingdom without "The King." But all such attempts at the divorce of ethics from religion is as futile as the attempts to ripen grapes

by moonlight. Christian civilization can not be acquired without Christ.

III.

The end of the century points to Christian missions as the controlling force in the realization of international peace and the federation of the race.

Let us glance, for a moment, at the international situation of the day. Germany, Austria and Italy have their "Dreibund" for defense and, if need be, aggressive warfare. France has at last coquetted Russia into a counter alliance, in order to recapture her coveted Alsace-Lorraine. England by her isolation and determined colonial policy is vexatiously pushing up the Nile, the Niger, the Himalayahs and South Africa, jostling as she goes, the Germans, Russians, French, Soudanese and Boers. Turkey, still reeking with her unrebuked butcheries and Grecian spoliation, has grown insolent and self-assertive. All European eyes and hands are greedy in the hasty partition of Africa. Even America feels she must have far-away Hawaii, though if we have to quadruple our fleet in order to hold the islands in time of foreign wars. And above, and over all looms the greatest of all conflicts—the antagonism of the Oriental nations towards the Occidental. These two civilizations are antagonistic. Captain Mahan in his thoughtful and commanding article in *Harper's Magazine* for September, 1897, has thus spoken of the impending conflict between the Orient and the Occident: "They have existed apart, each a world of itself, but they are approaching not only in geographical propinquity, a recognized source of danger, but, what is more important, in common ideas of material advantage, without a corresponding sympathy in spiritual ideas. It is not merely that the two are in different stages of development from a common source, as are Russia and Great Britain. They are running as yet on wholly different lines, springing from conceptions radically different. To bring them into correspondence in that the most important realm of ideas, there is needed on the one side—or on the other—not growth but conversion. * * The great task now before the world of civilized Christianity, its great mission, which it must fulfill or

perish, is to receive into its bosom and raise to its own ideals those ancient and different civilizations by which it is surrounded and outnumbered—the civilizations at the head of which stand China, India and Japan."

This is the testimony of a cultured, military critic, which weighs heavy in the continued attacks upon heathendom.

Recall the attitude of Japan. She has grown recklessly independent and hilariously patriotic. Armed and trained according to the best European models, and intensely ambitious, she stands to assert afresh the integrity and right of her self guidance and national expansion of territory. China—vast, sullen, resolute, immovable in her pride and cunning, is adopting the material advantages of Western culture.

Within the last six months a sinister light has been cast over the future of China. The Chino-Japanese war revealed her weakness and disorganized condition. Russia has now taken from Japan Port Arthur and its hinterland. Germany has practically a limitless lease at Kias Chan and its abutting territory. England, not to be outdone by her great Northern rival, has checkmated Russia by seizing Wei-Hai-wei, and France asserts her right to more territory. Ultimately this game of grab may be of inestimable benefit to pagan China, but for the present generation of Chinamen it affords a disgusting spectacle of greed on the part of nations which pose as Christian. It is not Christian. It is straight, brutal force which has acquired the territory and planned the partition of China. To appease the hate and distrust aroused by this international brigandage the Church must redouble her efforts to impress the true Christianity upon distracted China.

India in semi-revolt, is slowly being welded into a nation, is crying out for legislative representation and pressing her mystical, religious claims upon her political masters. This is the far Eastern situation to which Captain Mahan refers as the overshadowing conflict of the age. He warns Europe not to disarm, for none can tell when all the European armies and navies may be needed to hold in check the New East. So let us say to the Christian army of missionaries—"Do not disarm, but struggle

all the harder for that spirit of justice and peace which shall preserve both international and continental harmony." For Christianity holds the key to the situation, first, in its ideal of history, and secondly, in the motive power which makes for peace. It declares that the kingdom of God is the goal of history. The history of the world has proved that there can be no genuine brotherhood without divine Fatherhood. Paul declares: "He (God) hath made of one blood." Here we have the first great centre of international reconciliation—God the Father. Then Paul sweeps on to the recognition of nationality in the words—"All nations for to dwell on the face of the earth." A common divine origin, a common ideal humanity, and a genuine nationality are the three elements of the Christian answer to the continental and international greed and conflict of our age. The only effective reconciliation will be found in him who said "And I if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me." Thus, and thus alone, shall we realize that state *

"Till the war-drum throbs no longer and the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

IV.

The final and most convincing answer to our question is the fact that the end of the century finds Christian missions more widely accepted and effective than at any other period in the history of the Church. We are still in the seeding time of modern Christian missions. The Reformation, and European wars, consumed the energies of the Church for two centuries. But, at the close of the last century, the revival of missionary work was accomplished by a few earnest souls. Christianity is the only religion which has not deteriorated in religious practice and vitality. Its very aggressiveness of to-day is the supreme evidence of its divine conception and propulsion. The impossibility of giving in barest outlines the geographical and racial distribution of missions in this short paper is obvious. One can but mention sources of information. And first to be named is the small but complete work of Dr. Bliss, "A Concise History of Missions." This fresh statement is within the reach of all.

Dr. Dennis' "Foreign Missions After a Century," Dr. Pierson's "The Miracles of Missions," Dr. Leonard's "A Hundred Years of Missions," are worthy contributions, easily secured, and replete with the modern conquests of the cross. Permit a summary of forces:

The Bible is wholly or partially translated in three hundred and twenty languages. This work of Bible translation and circulation creates the atmosphere for the more personal campaign of preaching. Two hundred and eighty-three societies are now organized in Protestantism for the sending of the Word and the pastors. There are now thirteen thousand missionaries in the various lands. Sixty thousand native helpers are associated with them. Five millions of people once without Christ are directly or indirectly under the influence of gospel teaching. There are one million and fifty thousand communicants in the various Protestant fields. Six hundred and seventy-eight thousand children are in the mission schools. I venture to add a few statements from Lovett's "Primer of British Missions," upon India, Africa and China. Some of the fruits of missionary labor in India may be summarized as follows:

1. A Protestant native Church has been gathered numbering half a million, and increasing at a very rapid rate. This Church is officered by 797 native pastors; and furnishes 3,491 other preachers.

2. Uplifting has been brought to the women of India. The immolation of widows and female infanticide has been stopped. 102,000 women and girls are now in the schools of the land.

3. The fifty millions of low castes (Panchamas) of India are rapidly being emancipated from the hard serfdom in which they have been kept for untold centuries.

4. Missionaries have taken the lead in every branch of education of the people of India.

5. Scholarly dictionaries and grammars have been prepared of most of the languages; their literature studied; a new literature set on foot, adapted to present-day needs, consisting of newspapers, periodicals, school books and other works.

6. There are abundant signs of the decadence of idolatry.

The mythology and cosmogony of the Puranas has been thoroughly discredited in the light of English education. Pantheism is being displaced by Theism and the caste theory of creation by the brotherhood of man. The authority of conscience, the claims of righteousness and the spirituality of true worship are generally admitted. The fear of Christianity is in every temple of the land.

7. Mohammedanism has been profoundly affected. Its theology and institutions are becoming rapidly liberalized.

In studying Africa as a great mission field, we may freely claim the following as the chief permanent results of a century's work:

1. Had it not been for Christian missions, Africa would still have remained very largely a *terra incognita*. In every part the heaviest burden of pioneer work has been borne by the missionaries. Commerce has succeeded, not preceded the Gospel. Vanderkemp, Moffat, Livingston, Barnabas Shaw, Kröpf, Rebman, and their colleagues in exploration, were only the leaders of a great Christian host who have opened up the highways into the heart of the Dark Continent.

2. Missionary effort in Africa has from the first thrown its influence strongly on the side of native rights. This action has rendered missionary enterprise still more obnoxious to those who believe that the best way of dealing with native races is to clear them off the face of the earth as quickly as possible, either by rifle or by the even more deadly alcohol of "civilization." Vanderkemp had hardly set foot in Africa when he and James Reed began that battle on behalf of the Hottentots, so nobly continued in later days by Dr. Philip and his helpers. From Livingstone, possibly more than any other man, did African slavery receive the mortal blow from which it is slowly but surely dying.

3. Missionary labor and example have brought a new life into Africa, have given its people fresh hope, have placed before them an attainable ideal of life. The century's work has been largely preparatory. It is no easy task to lift humanity in the scale of thought and life.

4. Wherever the missionary goes there literature follows. It

is no small feat to have unlocked the door into the Bible for scores of African languages and dialects.

May I add one word concerning China—one of the most obstinate opponents to the introduction of Christian civilization. The increase of the Church has been remarkable. In 1850 there were about 200 communicants; there are now about 40,000 in addition to very many Christians (clerical and lay) who have been called to their rest. In 1892 an imperial decree was issued, bearing on the toleration of Christianity. For the first time Christianity was placed along with Buddhism and Taoism among the lawful religions of China. The Empress Dowager of China lately received a copy of the New Testament, and the Emperor himself sent to the depot of the American Bible Society to purchase a copy of the Bible and other Christian literature. Who can tell what the influence of the interest of these royal personages may be upon the literati and the people generally? The late war with its rude awakening of China to its own weak and backward condition, will probably foster a spirit of inquiry, and will help to remove prejudices. The last six months has witnessed a marked revival of religion and thousands have been baptized into the Christian fold. The native newspapers are coming under Christian control. Slowly the eyes and heart of China are opening to the glories of the Christ. As go China, Japan and India so goes the whole field. Space forbids even a glance at the magnificent work accomplished in other sections of the globe. I would close this crude presentation of missions at the end of the century with the thrilling words of a cautious, learned, Christian student of Eastern religions—Sir Monier Williams. "Go forth, then, ye missionaries, in your Master's name; go forth into all the world, and, after studying all its false religions and philosophies, go forth and fearlessly proclaim to suffering humanity the plain, the unchangeable, the eternal facts of the Gospel—nay I might almost say the stubborn, the unyielding, the inexorable facts of the Gospel. Dare to be downright with all the uncompromising courage of your own Bible, while with it your watchwords are love, joy, peace, reconciliation. Be fair, be charitable, be Christ-

like, but let there be no mistake. Let it be made absolutely clear that Christianity cannot, must not, be watered down to suit the palate of either Hindu, Parsee, Confucianist, Buddhist or Mohammedan, and that whosoever wishes to pass from the false religion to the true can never hope to do so by the rickety planks of compromise, or by the help of faltering hands held out by half-hearted Christians. He must leap the gulf in faith, and the living Christ will spread his everlasting arms beneath, and land him safely on the Eternal Rock."

ARTICLE III.

WHAT THE PASTOR OWES TO HIS PULPIT.

BY REV. T. B. BIRCH, A. M.

Some have thought that the evangelical churches have given preaching a position of too great prominence in public worship, and that too frequently other functions of the minister are partially, or entirely ignored; but the mission of the apostles was primarily that of teaching and preaching. The apostles gave themselves "continually to prayer and the ministry of the word." By continually turning to God in prayer, they were able to receive his message in its purity; then, by turning towards men, they were able to deliver their "glad tidings" most effectively by the "foolishness of preaching." And when the Reformers gave to Protestant preaching the central place in public worship, they emphasized the prominence which must be given this function of the minister. We will not state that the Word is the chief means of grace; but that it is the means of grace most efficaciously employed by the pastor in instilling and developing faith, is quite evident from the testimony of experience, and the direct statement of the Bible—"Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God."

The Reformation was very largely the result of the preaching of the Word with power; and ever since, as the Gospel has been the power of God for the salvation of men, it has been a

Gospel proclaimed chiefly by tongue or pen; it has been a Gospel interpreted by the experiences of redeemed men, and heralded most efficiently by the voice of a consecrated ministry influencing the hearts and consciences of men by all the skill that art and science could furnish.

We are led to believe that the pulpit is the minister's throne of power, that the productiveness of his ministry is largely dependent upon his public preaching, that by good pulpit-service the pastor is able to reach and nourish more persons than through any other channel. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession says: "Nothing attaches the people to the Church more than good preaching." A minister may be well trained in the use of the liturgy, may have the ability to govern well a congregation, may be endowed with all the social graces and tact necessary to perform satisfactorily his pastoral duties; but the exercise of these abilities cannot supply the place of good preaching.

We do not intend to underrate the other functions of the man of God, or to separate preaching from his other duties; by no means, for all his other ministrations supplement and give tone and point to his preaching. We seek to emphasize the position preaching holds in the vocation of the ministry, and what may render it efficacious for good.

From the pulpit the pastor can best teach and instruct all of his congregation. When we remember that a large portion of the flock is regularly taught by pulpit-preaching only, we can readily conclude that the minister should give his best energies to preaching to the congregation and not to other labor, especially to that of those many smaller services. Suppose the preacher does not preach well on the Sabbath, but labors diligently and earnestly during the week—makes many calls, attends some meeting every evening and directs the work of all; does he reach more persons if the Sabbath congregations go away dissatisfied, and the other small audiences well pleased? Would it not be wise to utilize the best energies in teaching and feeding the larger congregations rather than allow them to go home dissatisfied with the sermon? This may not mean that the less important duties and services should be neglected, but

that the pulpit must never suffer for the sake of less important labor. The Confession says: "If you wish to attach the Church to you, you must try accordingly to teach and preach aright; thereby you can produce a good-will and constant obedience." A pastor cannot be guilty of any greater fault, as pastor, than that of neglecting his pulpit-preaching, either from dissipating his strength in minor work to the neglect of the major, or in being negligent in both. Jeremiah says: "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord negligently," and with greatest force does this apply to the special and chief work unto which the minister is dedicated, for he is sent to preach the Gospel; and only from the sacred desk can that large, silent part of the congregation be instructed, and a spirit of good-will and constant obedience be developed and promoted; therefore, the congregation must be given the best that the pastor by prayer, meditation, and study can bring to them, and with all diligence must he labor for that which will make successful all the efforts of this most important of his duties—public preaching.

Most diligently should the pastor strive to come into the pulpit with the best personal preparation, with choice knowledge compressed into the most beneficial discourse based upon the Word of God, containing nothing but the Word of God simply and plainly stated and expounded, and also having that practical and theoretical knowledge of rhetoric and oratory which will aid him to communicate his message in a most forcible manner; that with the blessing of God attending him, he may be able to establish a bond of sympathy between himself and his people, to convince and convict them of sin and of righteousness and to stimulate their intellectual and emotional natures, that interested thought may be developed and deep emotions may be aroused which will place them upon a higher plane, promote a better manhood and establish Jesus Christ in their hearts as the ruling power.

But frequently we speak of a preacher as a skillful performer, and his efforts as a most creditable performance; even pastors are inclined to be more interested in criticizing the minister and his preaching in the light of the skillful application of the rules

of rhetoric and oratory. It is ordinarily necessary for every one who aspires to success in the ministry to have studied these rules, and to be proficient in the exercise of them; but that which should chiefly "occupy the thoughts of a preacher are piety, knowledge and the blessing of God." There are those towards whom have been attracted the eyes of men who delight in the performance of the preacher, and around whom arises the fascinating incense of applause; but if they are masters of words only, and have not great thoughts which arise from a "close, large, varied and original life with God," and have no high sense of the tremendous responsibility which is revealed by a near, pietistic life with God, or if they do not have that holy enthusiasm which arises from a close, spiritual communion with Christ, there will not long be any in their congregations who love Christ more than words; and, by and by, that applause which was constant, will become meteoric, then die out entirely; for the supply will fail to meet the ever increasing demand. But when the fragrance of the pietistic life of the preacher is revealed in his preaching—all other things being equal—there will be a large spiritual life in the congregation, and an earnest desire for food which will supply the demands of a hungering and thirsting after Christ and his righteousness.

But this spiritual power of the pastor as exercised in preaching must be acquired in secret. He must first know God before he can rightly and clearly tell others of him. Unless he ever seeks by prayer, devotional reading and meditation to condition his own mind and heart, ever strives to live a truly pious life and to experience the power of the Holy Ghost's influence in leading to desire and strive to know more and more of God's power experimentally, and to grow day by day in all the Christian graces—unless he learns in this experimental manner of the power of God's truth and grace, he will not be able to make another to understand, that he may be influenced to accept Christ as his personal Saviour. The pastor must be able, not only to teach the precepts as precepts, but be able, by having experienced the power of the truths in his own religious life and soul-building, to teach them as facts of which he knows full

well the truth and the certainty of similar results being wrought in his hearers if they will hearken unto and give good heed to the Word of God. The minister must live the Christ-life, then he can be made the receiver of a divine communication, and be best prepared to deliver that message from the pulpit in language intelligible to his congregation. St. Paul, that intellectual giant, cultivated a close acquaintance with that Incarnation of truth and piety. Three thoughts he uttered show the progress he made in humility and grace as he came nearer. As though boasting he first said: "Paul called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God;" then five years later he wrote: "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;" then five years later, he called himself "the chief of sinners." The nearer he approached Christ and the more his thoughts were permeated with him, the richer became his knowledge of Christ crucified and his relations to him and to others. Coming close to Christ, his soul first drank in the great truths of Christ's messages, and while the warmth of the message was in his heart and the glow of it lingered upon his face as in a more pronounced way the face of Moses shone, Paul turned to his audience, and this man, whom some thought had an impediment in his speech, took the truths of Christ and so interpreted them unto his hearers that they marveled at his learning and persuasive eloquence, and many accepted the Christ he lived and taught. Surely, such preaching and such sermons must have measured up to Tholuck's high ideal of a sermon, he says: "It must have heaven for its father and earth for its mother;" that it should be "a word which is at the same time both a message from God and a message to men." And how can this be possible, unless, like Paul, the pastor lives the life of Christ, unless there is a deep-seated piety in him which will radiate in all directions, permeate thought, word and deed, the very act of delivering the sermon!

But the work of the pastor is not merely to live close to Christ, to catch his message and to be able to interpret it spiritually, to know the truth and language of heaven; he must

know the language of earth and the best methods of conveying the heavenly message unto beings of earth. For this purpose, the minister must have a breadth of knowledge such as is demanded of no other profession.

While we seem to have unduly emphasized piety as a qualification of the pastor, we do not intend to do so at the expense of other important qualifications. We sometimes hear that most fallacious idea advanced, that if the heart is right, our desires are pure and we are sincerely interested in the work of saving souls, we are fully prepared to occupy the pulpit, and that, when we wish to speak, the Lord will supply the words of life. The colored Bishop, in Baltimore, answered that argument. In addressing several applicants for ordination, he said that if they were to go unprepared into their pulpits, and expected that, when they opened their mouths, the Lord would "fill them;" they would discover that the Lord would "fill them, but with wind." The preacher must be a man who has *something to say* as well as be in the proper mood to formulate what he desires to speak; and he must know how to express it. Knowledge is fundamental for and gives rise to the play of the inspiring mind. Those who have become men of inspiration have usually been men of great learning or those who earnestly sought knowledge, men of large experience, men who knew the ways of reaching men. A Moses learned the art of speaking, but only that he might the better express the accumulated learning of the Egyptians, and his constantly increasing Jewish and divine wisdom. Paul was learned in all the Jewish lore; he sat at the feet of Gamaliel. The disciples, although unlearned in the wisdom of the schools, were men who had been trained in the school of experience and especially trained for their mission during those three years of sitting Mary-like, at the feet of Jesus. Luther pondered long and studiously over and delved deep into that unchained Bible. All those who have made any durable impression upon the religious world have been men of knowledge and rich experience, and were ever learning; so must the preacher of to-day be a man ever studiously inclined, ever engaged in searching for knowledge that he may prepare it to

instruct his people, ever going out into new, safe fields that his matter may be crisp, attractive and strengthening.

The nuggets of truth found by hard, earnest, prayerful digging into the Scriptures must be laid upon God's altar.

Theology must yield her treasures unto the earnest student, that he, directed by the Spirit, may lead his hearers to God through Jesus Christ. The pastor owes his congregation the fruits secured by a most diligent, honest study of systematic theology. The fundamental Christian doctrines must be thoroughly studied and understood that there may be no contorted teaching of the plan of salvation, or a one-sided development of it.

Church history should be given its due amount of studious attention that its abundant stores of information may also assist the pastor in preparing for his pulpit ministrations.

We cannot enumerate all of the many sources from which the pastor must draw if he would place God's message before his congregation as attractive, helpful, well-seasoned food, which will be easily assimilated, and will satisfy the hunger of the soul, and strengthen it spiritually. The sources of knowledge are so varied and so helpful and the demands upon the pulpit so emphatically urgent for this varied, well-assimilated knowledge, that a young preacher, like Jeremiah, may well say he is tongue-tied, that he lacks something to say; but God says to the one who is willing to study, not only willing, but is a student in the best sense: "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth," for all truth is of God, and, if by hard study we gain knowledge, it is in accordance with God's law of increase:—"God helps those who help themselves." We have no reason to believe that God will perform for the minister what he can do for himself by study. The day of miracles will never dawn upon the pastor if he passes the dead line and falls asleep. The indolent need not expect the aid of the Holy Spirit if he will not study. The Spirit will lead and aid the one seeking to move forward, but he will not drag him along; therefore, the most diligent study is demanded of the minister; not only that of books, but also that which he may gain by observation of

nature and human nature, and by constant reflection upon all the information gained by thinking, feeling, observation, hearing, reading and by study. The results are expected to be brought into the pulpit, that the congregation may be well instructed, and directed in matters religious, moral and also social, by teaching them in what realms the golden rule holds sway and how best to apply it practically.

We will not emphasize the need of knowledge of rhetoric and of oratory, both practical and theoretical; not that we undervalue it, but because the average minister is not so apt to fail in these respects as in gathering material for the sermon.

But all is not done which is due the pulpit when the pastor has lived a life of Christian piety, has gathered the material for the discourse, has cultivated that style of composition and delivery which will be best adapted to reach the waiting congregation through his own personality. The pastor owes it to himself and his people to seek and secure the blessing of God upon the use of his Word, the pastor's personality, the results of the labor expended, and that his blessing may attend him in the delivery, and the congregation in the hearing and reception of the message. God's blessing must attend all the efforts put forth, or all is a failure; and how can the pastor confidently approach God and ask his blessing upon his labors and expect an answer to his prayer unless he has faithfully performed his duty? That he, privately and publicly, presumes to ask God's blessing upon his pulpit ministrations presupposes that all the essential conditions have been met; that he has been living the Christ-life during the week, that he has been earnestly and wisely laboring to make the best preparation for this chief function of his Father's business. That his ministry of the Word may be eminently successful, God's blessing must be invoked, and that it may be obtained, the conditions must be met, and the preacher must have that large faith in God's perfect willingness to bless this function of his ministry in all its relations and faith in his almighty power to make the work efficacious for good, to make his Word accomplish that whereunto it is sent and not return unto him void of results. Did the pastor possess such faith

coupled with the rightly combined proportion of good works, he would go about his Father's business as though he fully believed that all the bread cast upon the waters would return again even if after many days.

We believe that the preceding thoughts are consistent with the method which Paul justified by its results, ever emphasizing the agency of God. "God hath chosen" the minister; "Of God are ye in Christ Jesus;" "Of God he is made unto you wisdom;" "After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed." The pastor "determined not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified," and equally resolved and persistent in acquiring that material and method and power which may best set forth the simple story of the Cross, and even seeking the blessing of God upon his ministry, will realize the truth of that encouraging declaration: "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things which are; that no flesh should glory in his presence."

The pastor realizing the truth of the passage, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts," ever recognizing the agency of God, and becoming a willing, intelligent, faithful instrument in the hands of God, will labor in the fear and power of the Lord unto the glorifying of his name and the salvation of men.

ARTICLE IV.

CONFESSION.*

BY REV. J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

The XIth Article of the Augsburg Confession reads as follows: "*De Confessione* docent, quod absolutio privata in ecclesiis retinenda sit, quamquam in confessione non sit necessaria omnium delictorum enumeratio. Est enim impossibilis juxta Psalmum: Delicta quis intelligit?"

The German text is: "Von der Beichte wird also gelehret, dass man in der Kirchen Privatam Absolutionem erhalten und nicht fallen lassen soll, wiewohl in der Beichte nicht noth ist, alle Missethat und Sünden zu erzählen, dieweil doch solches nicht möglich ist, Psalm 19: 13: Wer Kennet die Missethat?"

The English Version is: "Concerning confession they teach that private absolution ought to be retained in the churches; although an enumeration of all our offences is not necessary in confession. For this is impossible, according to the declaration of the Psalmists: Who can understand his errors? Ps. 19: 12."

THE OCCASION OF THIS ARTICLE.

The question that waits for the first answer in considering the article on Confession is, Why does it find a place in every ven-

*The Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 1, 1898.

The following are the principal works consulted in the preparation of this lecture: Various Cyclopaedias, especially Herzog's Realencyklopädie, edition of 1897; Die Privatbeichte und Privatabsolution, Georg Edward Steitz; Luthardt's Kompendium der Dogmatik; Fisher's History of Christian Doctrine; Kurtz's Church History; Geschichte der Speciellen Seelsorge von August Hardeland; Hutter's Compend of Lutheran Theology; Hodge's Systematic Theology; Schmidt's Dogmatics; Martensen's Christian Dogmatics; Chemnitz's Enchiridion; Krauth's Augsburg Confession; The Book of Concord; Dr. Hay's Translation of Köstlin's Theology of Luther; Miller's Clerical Manners; Hoppin's Pastoral Theology; Baxter's Reformed Pastor; Maclaren's Cure of Souls; Daniel's Codex Liturgicus.

erable Augustana? Does it not compromise us as Protestants with its apparent Romish flavor? And must we explain it away or at least make apologies for it? Such inquiries should be fairly met, especially in view of the fact that private confession as contemplated by the Reformers is practically unknown to-day in any Lutheran country. Was it, therefore, a mistake to include private confession among the doctrinal articles? We may reply that the very evident reason for the existence of this article was the prominence and the gross abuse of the Confessional in the Romish church. The absence of any reference to it would have been very strange, and might have been construed into a tacit approval of it. The Reformers, therefore, very properly assaulted this stronghold of Romanism, captured it, purified it, and temporarily occupied it as a training school for its fresh, young forces.

But how shall we explain away the incongruity that the Reformers seem at first sight to "have made an article of faith" out of private confession which has now ceased to exist as a distinct institution? Were they in error? The answer is that the "doctrine" to be maintained in this article is found in its negative rather than its positive statement. It is not so much private confession and private absolution that are retained as it is Romish confession that is condemned. "Enumeration of all offences is not necessary in confession. For this is impossible, according to the Psalm, who can understand his errors?" Thus the Augsburg Confession forever repudiates and disowns Romish auricular confession. The doctrine, therefore, taught is that auricular confession is not only "not necessary" but "impossible" and unscriptural.

That this explanation is no subterfuge but entirely in accord with the spirit of the Augustana may be seen by a comparison with Article XXI, in which "the worship of saints" is repudiated in the same negative manner.

The positive statement that "private absolution ought to be retained" does not differ essentially from the doctrine taught in Article XII, which declares "that the Church should give absolution unto such as return to repentance." There is no doubt

that the Lutheran Church does teach and practice absolution. Indeed rightly understood, all churches believe and practice absolution, though not as a part of their *cultus*. The "private" part of confession and absolution as taught in this article is merely incidental and temporary. It belongs to the *adiaphora*, things indifferent, the category of human rites and ceremonies which may be accepted or rejected according to convictions of expediency. Article XXV. very plainly says "that confession is of human right only, not commanded by Scripture, but instituted by the Church." The Reformers were undoubtedly the best judges of what was proper and useful in their day. And as they have made confession purely voluntary, why should they be blamed? Moreover, they had, as we hope to be able to show ample ground for holding on to an institution, divested of harmful and objectionable features. It was entirely in harmony with the conservatism of the Lutheran Reformation that this should be done. It rejected nothing that was not morally or scripturally wrong in their churches or in their worship. The wisdom of some of these things may be questioned, but their design and motive are unimpeachable.

THE DOCTRINE OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.

A consideration of the matter of private confession and absolution demands primarily a right understanding of Romish or auricular confession, which our article so strenuously rejects. It was and still is one of the chief pillars of the papacy. It was one of the principal sources of its corruption and thus gave occasion for the Reformation. The Ninety-five Theses are practically a challenge to its false teachings in regard to indulgences and the whole subject of repentance.

The Romish Church regards penance, *poenitentia*, repentance or penitence as one of seven sacraments as well as a virtue. "As a virtue it consists in sorrow for sin, a determination to forsake it, and a purpose to make satisfaction to God. As a sacrament it is an ordinance instituted by Christ for the remission of sins committed after baptism, through the absolution of a priest having jurisdiction. The *matter* of the sacrament is the

act of the penitent, including contrition, confession and satisfaction. The *form* is the act of absolution on the part of the priest. By contrition is meant sorrow or remorse. It is not necessary that this contrition should be anything more than a natural as distinguished from a gracious exercise or state of mind; or as the Romanists express it, it is not necessary that contrition should be '*caritate perfecta*.' The confession included in this assumed sacrament must be auricular; it must include all mortal sins; a sin not confessed is not forgiven. This confession is declared by the Council of Trent to be necessary to salvation. * * * In sin there is both a '*reatus culpæ*' and a '*reatus poenæ*.' The former together with the penalty of eternal death, is removed by absolution; but the '*reatus poenæ*' as to temporal punishment, to be endured either in this life or in in purgatory, remains or may remain. Hence the necessity of satisfaction for sin in the sense above stated. The absolution granted by the priest is not merely declarative, but judicial and effective."

"On this point the Romish Church teaches: first, that Christ blots out sin by the ministry of the priests; second, that the priests sit as judges on the tribunal of repentance; third, that their sentence is confirmed in heaven; fourth that in virtue of this power the priests are above the angels and archangels themselves."*

Auricular confession, therefore, is one of the links in the chain of salvation. Without it there can be no remission of the temporal or eternal consequences of sin. The priest holds absolute sway over the destiny of the race. Every soul must bow before him as a mediator and obey his mandates. To him must be confided not only every act committed, but also every intention and feeling. To omit in confession even a forgotten sin is to leave it unforgiven. To hide from him anything from a sense of modesty or shame is only to increase one's guilt. Can anything more imperious, tyrannical, terrifying, yea diabolical be conceived of? Then to commit such unlimited power into the hands of men who were in many instances ignorant, unsympa-

*Hodge's Theol. Vol. III., p. 493.

thetic and sensual was to produce results which history blushes to record.

THE HISTORY OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.

The development of auricular confession was very gradual. The exact point at which it originated is not easily determined. The Romanists trace it back to the apostles. Some attribute its rise to Origen in the third century. As a matter of fact it is the slow outgrowth of a perversion of a good, scriptural idea. The Bible enjoins confession. It conditions the forgiveness of sins on it. Luther speaks of three kinds of confession: first, that which one makes to God; secondly, that which he makes to his neighbor, whose rights he may have transgressed; and thirdly, that which he makes voluntarily to a minister or Christian brother for the sake of his advice or comfort. It is this last kind of confession that drifted into the Romish auricular confession. Beginning as a voluntary act, under the encouragement of the priests it became a custom, later a law, and finally an iron yoke, which was broken by the hammer that nailed the Theses to the church door at Wittenberg.

There is no evidence that confession existed as a part of the cultus of the Church during the first century of the Christian era. "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," belonging to the second century contains no allusion to auricular confession. It inculcates, however, great reverence for religious teachers. It says (Chap. iv.), "My child him that speaks to thee the Word of God remember night and day, and thou shalt honor him as the Lord; for where that which pertaineth to the Lord is spoken, there the Lord is." The exomologesis or general confessions of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Cyprian of the third century, which have some times been quoted as favoring auricular confession, pertain really to the treatment of penitents.

In the third century, however, it became the custom to appoint a special priest, whose duty it was to direct the exercises of penitents guilty of secret sins which they voluntarily confessed to him under the seal of secrecy. But on account of gross abuses the Patriarch Nectarius of Constantinople abolished

the office, A. D. 391. The practice, however, continued in the West until Leo the Great, about the middle of the fifth century, introduced such changes in the mode of dealing with penitents that the office ceased to be important. He prohibited bishops from demanding public confession for secret sins; and in place of it introduced private confession which every priest was entitled to hear. But private confession was intended only for those mortal sins, which having been publicly committed, would according to former canons have required public penance. Jerome denounced as a piece of pharisaical arrogance the assumption that the power of the keys implied any judicial authority. While Leo claimed that the forgiveness of God could not be obtained without the intercession of priests, and guaranteed their efficacy, yet he does not venture to claim any judicial power for the Church.

The practice of private confession as a regular and necessary preparation for the communion was wholly unknown at that period. In the meantime, however, private confession had been fostered in and required of the inmates of cloisters, where it was comparatively easy to enforce what the laity resisted for a longer period. The Synod of Liege (A. D. 710) demanded that confession be made at least once a year to the parish priest.

During this period the formula of absolution was only of a deprecatory not of a judicial character.* This view prevailed for centuries. As late as the middle of the twelfth century Peter the Lombard said, Forgiveness is ever the work of God. The signification of absolution is only the announcement of what God has done. This he derived from two passages of Scripture. The cleansed leper was to show himself to the priest. Matt. 8 : 4; and the disciples loosed the grave clothes of the awakened Lazarus. John 11 : 44.†

The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) confirmed the now almost universal custom of confession by elevating it into an absolute requirement. All persons of both sexes, after reaching years of discretion, were commanded to confess all their sins alone at

*Kurtz's Church History, Vol. I, p. 348.

†Hardeland. *Gesch. der spec. Seelsorge*, c. iii. 136.

least once a year, to the parish priest. "This is the first canon known which orders sacramental confession generally, and may have been occasioned by the teachings of the Waldenses that neither confession nor satisfaction was necessary in order to obtain remission of sins."

The formula of absolution was now changed from the intercessory, *Dominus absolvat te* to the judicial, *Ego te absolvo*. Thomas Aquinas (died 1274) later defended this, though he declares, *Solus Deus remittet culpam*.

The Synods of the sixteenth century urge the laity to confess frequently; and required the clergy to confess once a week and the nuns once a month. The Council of Trent reaffirmed the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council. It decreed further, as a matter of good order, that confession must take place in the church and in the confessional. Later enactments of the Roman Catholic Church have not materially changed the form or character of auricular confession.

THE REJECTION OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.

The disenfranchisement of Luther from the bonds of Romanism was naturally gradual. As a loyal son of the Church, he cherished all her teachings at first as inspired. Before the indulgence controversy he seems to have entertained no doubts in reference to the received doctrine concerning confession and absolution. He protests, however, in his *Lectures upon the Decalogue* "against such a minute analysis and classification of sins as to burden the memory of the people and weary the confessor. He does not consider it necessary, for example, to make exactly seven classes of mortal sins. Especially noteworthy is his declaration that it is not necessary to confess any inclination to pride unless one has yielded to it, since we are all constantly inclined in that direction; we ought, therefore, to mourn over it in secret and confess it before God. He maintains, moreover, *acedia* (disinclination to that which is good—indolence), being a spiritual infirmity, is not a proper subject for the confessional, but is to be made known to God alone, who is the only one who can provide a remedy. Thus Luther already assumes that there

is at least a certain sphere of the inner life which may be exempt from the supervision of the confessional, and that within this sphere the sinner may himself deal directly with God."*

The indulgence controversy, inaugurated by the Ninety-Five Theses, led Luther into a fuller examination of the so-called sacrament of penance and to sharp discrimination in regard to forgiveness and absolution. This culminated in the full development of his views on that cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, justification by faith. "If" during this period of his development "he always assumes that the regular and proper place for the reception of forgiveness is the confessional of the Church, and that the general and regular administrators of the power of the Keys are the priests, it is equally clear that he does not regard the dispensation of the divine forgiveness as a matter committed to the priest *alone*. Already in the German *Sermon vom Sacrament der Busse*, he places upon the same plane as that assigned to the official announcement of the priest, the declaration made by *any Christian brother* who assures us of the divine grace. * * He declares, yea where there is no priest, any Christian brother, even a woman or child, may do just as much; for when any Christian person can say to thee: God forgives thy sins in the name of Christ, &c., and thou canst receive the word with an unwavering faith, as though God spoke it to thee, thou art certainly absolved in this thy faith: so utterly and entirely does everything depend upon *faith in the Word of God*."† This idea he maintains most firmly and revolves it in various forms of expression. In all his subsequent career he never departs from the truth that "Christ did not wish to have the power and will of a man."

The more Luther examined the matter the clearer did it become to him that auricular confession was a torture of the conscience, and that it obscured the grace of God. He warns against the delusion that confession frees from guilt and that it is possible to confess all mortal sins. "He explains that confes-

*Köstlin's Theol. of Luther. I : 204 f.

†Köstlin's Theol. of Luther. I : 260.

sion is for him, essentially and chiefly a calling upon God to fulfil his promises, and an exercise of faith, which endeavors to lay hold of the promises without doubting, in order that to God may be all the glory. He even gives, with an appeal to Gerson, the seemingly paradoxical counsel: We may now and then approach the altar with a scruple of conscience, *i. e.* without first confessing, even if we have gone somewhat beyond proper bounds in eating, drinking or speaking. This we may do in order to accustom our consciences to depend entirely and alone upon God, and not be alarmed at every falling leaf."*

"Whether secret sins of the heart should also be confessed to the priest or only to God is an open question with him." In his controversy with Eck, Luther expressed the opinion that sacramental confession had no divine right. He positively maintained that it was not appointed by God, but by the Church. Even the latter did not at first employ auricular confession but only public confession. Luther was, however, not prepared to reject the former, but laments that it was made such a means of torture.*

He is also indignant at the cupidity of the unprincipled priests and beggar monks who degraded the confessional into a money-making machine. He inveighs in his usual emphatic way against the priests who worked upon the fears of women that they might reveal their secrets. That his denunciations of the coarse sensuality was abundantly justified is witnessed by the history of the confessional in later times. Lastyrie, a French nobleman, in his *History of Auricular Confession* says that the abuses of the confessional became so scandalous in Spain that Pope Paul IV. (1563) issued a brief to the inquisitors of Seville to prosecute the offending priests. This gave rise to such numerous denunciations of confessors by women that it took one hundred and twenty days to register them all. Nor are these abuses the product of a dark age alone. The late Dr. Kendrick, archbishop of Baltimore, one of the most learned of Catholics, says in his *Papal Conspiracy Exposed*, We scarcely dare to speak concerning that atrocious crime in which the office of hearing

*Köstlin's Theol. of Luther. 1 : 357.

confession is perverted to the ruin of souls by impious men under the influence of their lusts. Would that we could regard it as solely a conception of the mind, and as something invented by the enemies of the faith for the purposes of slander.*

Luther's final rejection of Romish confession rested upon dogmatic grounds which may be summarized as follows, and which might be illustrated with abundant quotations did not space forbid.†

1. It was not voluntary, but enforced as a duty.
2. It was limited to a particular time in the Easter season.
3. It required the enumeration of every sin.
4. It made repentance to consist of contrition, confession and satisfaction, while faith and consolation are barely mentioned.
5. It separated contrition entirely from faith, and made even a half-contrition, called *attritio* to suffice.
6. It rested absolution upon the sufficiency of contrition, and thus made it uncertain.
7. It rested satisfaction not upon the renewal of spiritual life, but on senseless works of man's invention.

THE PRIVATE CONFESSION OF THE REFORMERS.

It is true that the word *private* is not used in connection with confession, but only with absolution. Hence it has been intimated that the Reformers did not advocate private confession, yet this is contradicted not only by the plain construction of the article, but by facts. It was taught and practiced. The Schwabach Articles plainly say, "Private Confession" (XI). Nevertheless, it is true that the Reformers desired the confession not for the *privacy*, but for the opportunity of granting private absolution. There was, when properly understood and practiced, as little harm and as much good in private confession in the days of Luther as there is to-day in a private personal conference of a pastor or Christian layman with a sin-sick or troubled soul.

The outward form was retained. When it is asked what did the Reformers "retain," it may be said that they kept the custom

*Barnum's Romanism, pp. 511, 514.

†Steitz: Privatbeichte, pp. 90-97.

and external form of confession. The people were not dissuaded but encouraged to keep up their former custom of coming to the pastor to confess. The confessional boxes or cells or chairs (Beichtstühle) were also retained. However singular, to say the least, this would be to us as an innovation, it was entirely natural then and would cause no revulsion of the public mind. Besides the confessional other apartments in the Church were used. Most of the old Church Orders provide that formal confession must never take place elsewhere than in the church building, and generally in the choir, where the participants could be seen but not heard by others waiting in the body of the church.* The object of such an arrangement was to secure privacy that each individual might feel unconstrained by the presence of others. The justification for such a private interview, if any be needed beyond common sense, is found by Chemnitz† in the example of Christ who not only preached the Gospel publicly but also proclaimed pardon privately, particularly and individually (privatim, insonderheit oder personweise).

It was entirely voluntary. The Marburg and the Schwabach Articles, which are the foundation of the Augsburg Confession, both leave private confession voluntary. The former says it "should indeed be unconstrained and free;" the latter it "should not be enforced by laws, just as baptism, the sacrament, the Gospel should not be forced, but be free." Luther himself declares that he once in awhile takes the communion without first confessing, in order that he may not be tempted to exalt the custom into a necessary matter of conscience, and in order to show his contempt for the devil.‡ In one of his sermons against Carlstadt, who opposed even the Protestant idea of private confession, he says: "Confession is strictly enjoined by the Pope, and made a necessity. This necessity and compulsion I reject, and have severely attacked it. * * Hence I will not confess because the Pope has enjoined it or wants it. He shall leave confession free to me, and shall not make a command of it."

In the Larger Catechism, he says: "In reference to Confession

*Steitz, Privatbeichte, p. 133. †Enchiridion, p. 185.

‡Köestlin's Theolo. ii, 532.

we have ever taught that it should be free, that the tyranny of the Pope should be put down, and that we should be liberated from all constraints, and relieved from the intolerable burdens imposed on the Christian community. For hitherto, as we have all experienced, nothing has been more grievous than the compulsion of every one to confession. * * * For this [private] confession is not embraced in a command * * * but is left optional with every one who needs it, to use it to his necessity."

It was not regarded as a Sacrament. This statement requires some qualification. Luther and Melancthon both speak of absolution as a sacrament. The Augsburg Confession does not give the number of the sacraments, but the Apology mentions absolution as a sacrament. In reducing the number of the sacraments from seven, as held by the Romanists, to three Luther took a very long step. When he speaks of repentance or absolution as a sacrament, he uses the word in a very wide sense. "He remarks that the conception of a sacrament might appear to be applicable to a very wide range of subjects, to everything to which a divine promise has been given; as for example, prayer, the Word, the cross of the believer, etc. Yea, who can enumerate all the divine promises? But, in the proper sense of the term we speak of sacraments only where we have promises with signs attached to them. * * He remarks further, that if we should speak strictly we could not call repentance a sacrament, since it lacks a visible sign appointed by God.* The Lutheran Church has always recognized only two sacraments. Chemnitz says: "Absolution is not properly and truly a sacrament in the way or sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments."†

No enumeration of sins was required. Luther and the Confessions are particularly severe in their condemnation of the Romish requirement of a minute recital of all sins. Article XI. expressly declares that an enumeration of all offences is not necessary in confession; for it is impossible according to the

*Köestlin's Theol. I., 403 f.

†Schmid's Dogmatics, p. 542.

Psalm; Who can understand his errors? Article XXV. speaks in the same general way. Further quotations do not seem necessary on this point.

It was retained for the sake of the Absolution. "Absolution," as defined by the Apology, "is the Word of God, announcing to those who seriously confess their sins, the forgiveness of the same in accordance with the divine injunction. Private absolution is the application of this principle to the individual. Chemnitz says, When an ordained minister or in case of need an ordinary Christian, proclaims forgiveness privately to a poor sinner, who in true repentance and faith seeks and desires God's grace in Christ, this is private absolution.* The right to pronounce such absolution either publicly or privately has been conferred on the Church, by virtue of the power of the Keys, or by virtue of the words of promise: "Whosoever sins ye remit," etc., "What ye loose on earth," etc. This power has been given to the whole Church, to all Christians as a universal priesthood. For the sake of order, however, Luther would not allow a layman publicly to exercise this right, but privately he may do it to the fullest extent. Absolution, with Luther, has a very broad meaning. "The Gospel is a general absolution. The same Word, which in preaching is proclaimed publicly and in general terms, is then addressed particularly in private absolution to such individuals as desire it. This is nothing more than declaring the Gospel to a single person, who thus receives comfort in view of the confessed sin."† This absolution must be received in faith. "If thou believest, thou hast it; if thou believest not, thou hast nothing."‡

"Private absolution retains for Luther an exalted and peculiar value, from the fact that in it forgiveness is imparted to me as one particular person—privately, specially, individually. Thus I can be right certain of it as intended *for me*, and can grasp it for myself, whereas in the congregation it floats out over the whole assembly, and may indeed reach me with the rest, but I

*Chemnitz's Enchiridion, p. 185.

†Koestlin's Theol. II., 526. ‡Ibid. 522.

am still not so sure of it as when addressed to me alone."* In saying this, Luther speaks out of the fulness of his experience. "Melanchthon and Mathesius tell us of an aged brother in the monastery through whom the word of grace in this way first found deep and effectual lodgment in his heart."† He had also himself frequently comforted others in the confessional.

It was retained as a preparation for the Communion. Confession was originally not specially connected with the Lord's Supper. But it was quite natural that the evident need of self-examination should have gradually made confession and absolution a kind of an introduction to the Communion. The Reformers found and preserved this relation; and after awhile made it obligatory upon all communicants first to confess. But this latter was intended not as a burden to the conscience of the worshiper, but as a high privilege, and also as a safeguard to the purity of the communion.

Chemnitz, the prince of Lutheran theologians, a profound scholar and devout Christian, gives the following reasons for the retention of confession before the communion.‡ Their bearing is so general as to be practically a vindication of the system.

Confession should be practiced, according to Chemnitz:

1. That the pastor may ascertain whether his people have right views of the principal doctrines of the Christian religion; and if they have not, that he may have the opportunity of instructing them.
2. That he may discover whether they are truly penitent, and that he may teach them the nature and consequences of sin and the nature of true repentance.
3. That he may know the character of their faith, the ground and earnestness thereof, and with whom and through whom they seek forgiveness; and that in this interview he may explain the nature of the true faith and the importance of self-examination.

*Koeslin's Theology II., 529.

†Koeslin's Theology I., 62.

‡Chemnitz, Enchiridion, 189 f.

4. That he may learn the character of their resolutions of amendment and explain the nature and urgency thereof.

5. That he may be able in the most fitting manner to bring counsel and comfort to burdened and sorrowing consciences.

6. That Absolution may be sought, received and used in true repentance through faith.

"Because all these things are necessary," says he, "having the approval of God's Word and command, it is clear that such a confession has a good foundation. And when the people are properly instructed in these things, they will cheerfully and without compulsion come to such confession for their own good. And the pastors may very readily also inform themselves from these things how they should deal with those who confess."

THE DECAY OF PRIVATE CONFESSION.

The hopes and plans of the Reformers in reference to confession and private absolution were doomed to disappointment, if they indeed ever regarded it in the light of a permanent institution. Their repeated assertion that it was of human rather than of divine appointment, indicates the comparatively unsubstantial foundation upon which it rested. The conception of the Reformers was too ideal to be applied to a matter in which there were so many purely human elements. As an institution or a part of a cultus of the Church it has, therefore, passed away. The principle, however, underlying it abides and will always abide in the Church. The following are the chief reasons that led to its decay.

The impracticability of its application. Where congregations were small, it was an easy matter for the pastor to hold a personal conference with each member on the day preceding the communion. As the numbers increased into hundreds, it became impossible to give each one a satisfactory hearing. Hence, the mere perfunctory discharge of a sacred office lowered its tone, and made it an idle formality. In vain was it urged that confession was not intended so exclusively as a preparation for the Lord's Supper, and that it should be extended through the entire year. But an old custom was not easily changed, for at

no other time did the people feel the need of confession so much. One may easily understand how impossible it was for the pastor to counsel with several hundred people individually, and what impatience and even disorder might result from a gathering waiting to be heard one by one.

The worldliness of the Church. The proper use of private confession presupposes rather an advanced standard of piety, which did not exist then, and is rare to-day. The Church was just emerging from darkness, the people were ignorant and many of the preachers utterly indifferent to the highest welfare of the flock. Earnest yearning for spirituality on the part of the people, and a passion of souls on the part of the pastors, was far from being the rule. Hence, a spiritual conference was not much desired by many. Confession became a dead formality, and to many an *opus operatum*.

The effort to make it compulsory. Luther denied that private confession was obligatory. The symbols of the Church say the same thing, though earnestly recommending it. But an institution that may or may not be used, naturally loses its hold. The fanatics like Carlstadt refused to recognize it at all. Brenz and Osiander went to the other extreme, and insisted upon its sacramental character and its practice by every member of the Church. The Church Orders* (Kirchenordnungen) or Liturgies, almost without exception, demand attendance at private confession before being admitted to communion. "In some countries, as in Pomerania, the *public* confession was actually forbidden, and only *private* confession allowed. 'The Church enacted by law that no one should be admitted to the Eucharist without private confession and absolution' says Daniel, who quotes in support of his statement from the Prussian Agenda of 1525 and from the Wittenberg Consistorial Order of 1542 and from the Bergdorf Order of 1544."† In some of the more rigid Lutheran Churches it became a tribunal for the examination of the views of the

*Steitz, *Privatbeichte*, p. 110

†Dr. J. W. Richard in *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, Vol. 26, 355.

people on the Lord's Supper.* In examination of all this it may be said that the intention of the authorities was entirely evangelical, and that thus they sought to preserve the purity of their altars. Nevertheless it made a yoke of a privilege.

The exaction of a fee.† The payment of a fee for absolution degraded it in the eyes of the people. Even Luther's denunciation of it did not abolish it. The clergy was poor and felt the need of the perquisite. J. Gerhard defended the taking of the fee, Spener agreed with him, but preferred that it should take the form of a New Year offering. The Leipzig Faculty advanced eight reasons for its continuance. A. H. Francke quoted the example of cities like Frankfort-on-the-Main, Strasburg and Augsburg where the fee (Beichtgeld) was not in vogue. He personally refused it and justified himself for this course in a sermon on the abuse of the Lord's Supper (1699).

Dogmatic considerations.‡ Toward the close of the seventeenth century the doctrine underlying the subject and the formulas used was newly investigated. This agitation called the value and continuance of confession into question. The Reformed had since the sixteenth century maintained that absolution was *conditionata*, because dependent on repentance and faith, concerning the existence of which man is necessarily in doubt. Spener agreed with this proposition except that he held to the assurance of faith and did not hesitate to use the form, "I forgive," holding that it was practically the same as "I announce forgiveness." All these discussions strengthened a growing mistrust in private absolution. Public confession had prevailed in Württemberg since the sixteenth century, in Kursachsen since 1657. Schade, Spener's assistant, introduced it in Berlin in 1697. When taken to task by his colleagues, the Elector sanctioned it by an edict, making private confession optional on the ground that in numerous Lutheran Churches in Sweden, Denmark and North Germany and in all those of Holland private absolution was not practiced. The other state churches followed his example, except in Mecklenburg where, according to Kliefoth, it was never formally given up.

*Steitz, *Privatbeichte*, p. 116.

†Caspari in Herzog on *Beichte*.

Thus there was a gradual departure from the practice of private confession until it has ceased to exist as an institution. Efforts to revive it in recent times have not been successful, and it must be quite apparent that an institution which could not maintain itself under comparatively favorable circumstances in the past can have no future at least in its fixed form.

THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE.

Private Confession as an institution and as a part of the cultus of the Church has vanished, probably never to be reinstated. But, we are sure that there has been some loss in the decay of a practice which brought every member into intimate touch with his pastor. Tholuck regarded its loss as among the "injuries and wounds of the Church" and appealed to the students of theology before whom he preached on the Augsburg Confession on this wise: Ye that are to be the ministers of the Word in time to come, regard it as your vocation to heal these wounds of our Church, and to restore to it *Private Confession*, not Auricular Confession, which this article rejects.* Martensen says, "It is a matter of regret that private confession, as an institution * * has fallen into disuse; and that the objective point of union is wanting for the many, who desire to unburden their souls by confessing not to God only but to a fellow-man, and who feel their need of comfort and of forgiveness, which any one indeed may draw for himself from the Gospel, but which in many instances he may desire to hear spoken by a man, who speaks in virtue of the authority of his holy office."

"It cannot easily be denied," says the same author, "that Confession meets a deep need of human nature. There is a great psychological truth in the saying of Pascal, that a man often attains for the first time a true sense of sin, and a true stayedness in his good purpose, when he confesses his sins to his fellow-man, as well as to God."† Said Dr. Bühsel‡ of Berlin: "In the midst of this great awakening, the felt necessity of private confession became apparent. * * Through this private con-

*Krauth, Augsburg Confession, p. 79.

†Martensen, Dogmatics, pp. 444. 445.

‡Erinnerungen aus dem Leben eines Landgeistlichen, Vol. 1 : 262.

fession I obtained not only a clearer and fuller insight into the workings of human depravity and the deceitfulness of the human heart in general, but also of my own heart in particular."

The underlying principle of private confession is universally felt and acknowledged. To meet the object of the ministry, more than the public preaching of the Gospel is necessary, both to give the pastor a true insight into the spiritual condition of his people and to allow them to bring their individual perplexities to him for solution. The "cure of souls" must be the pastor's particular care.

Having allowed the institution intended to meet this want to lapse on account of its misuse, the problem of a substitute must be solved in personal conferences or consultations of the pastor and his flock, either in the study, in one of the rooms of the Church, or at homes of the members. An editorial in *The Outlook** speaks of such personal conferences as the most important aspect of pastoral life. "The Roman Catholic priest furnishes most of his counsels in this way. The preaching is an insignificant part of the priest's work; much more important is that part performed through the Confessional. Compulsory Confession appears to us, as to all Protestants, morally dangerous and disadvantageous; but the personal conference of a religious counselor with the troubled or inquiring soul, provided by the confessional is of the utmost importance. * * If, instead of preaching to five hundred, each one * * could come to him personally and bring his doubt, his difficulty, his sorrow, his trouble, whatever it is, and the minister could give counsel or comfort to each, * * the work would be far more efficacious."

Good Richard Baxter† says, a minister is not only to be employed in public preaching to his people, but should be a known counselor for their souls, as the lawyer is for their estates, and the physicians for their bodies. * * Every man that is in doubts and difficulties about matters of importance, should bring his case to his minister for resolution. Thus Nicodemus came to Christ. * * But how few are there who heartily press

**Outlook*, Vol. 56: 979.

†*The Reformed Pastor*, p. 56.

their people to it! * * Were they but duly sensible of the need and importance of it, you would have them knocking more frequently at your doors, to open their cases, to make their complaints, and to ask your advice."

A recent lecturer at the Yale Seminary, Dr. Watson (Ian Maclaren),* who will not be suspected of Romanism or High Churchism, says: "The pastor must give much of his time to *consultation*, and it is likely that he will have to give more every year. It is the custom of Protestants to denounce the confessional, and not without reason, * * but it would be wise to remember that there are times and moods and circumstances when every person desires to open his heart to some brother man, when some persons cannot otherwise get relief. To whom are these persons to go? What they want is one who has had a wide experience of life, who is versed in human nature, who is accustomed to keep secrets, who has faith in God and man, whose office invites and sanctions confidence. Who fulfils those conditions so perfectly as the minister of Christ? and is it not good that there is within reach one ordained to be a friend unto every one who is lonely and in distress of mind?"

The practical application of this thought is often hindered by temporal inconvenience. To overcome this, Dr. Miller of Princeton† recommended a weekly or fortnightly meeting of inquirers at the pastor's house. "A faithful pastor will rarely pass such an appointed time without some visitors. And some will go perhaps, and be happily led to the Saviour, who, but for such an appointment, would humanly speaking, have lost their serious impressions, and hardened themselves in sin." The suggestion of regular times of visiting the pastor, not socially, but for religious conversation is worthy of consideration. While pastoral visitation ought to be assiduously pursued, it will fail in a large parish of meeting its end from its infrequency, the absence of many members of the household and the lack of privacy. What a happy and profitable variation it would be for the people to come to the pastor when he cannot come to see them.

The testimony of the eminent authorities cited in this lecture

*The Cure of Souls, p. 235

†Letters on Clerical Manners, p. 129.

is entirely confirmed by a pastoral experience of more than twenty years, if you will allow a modest reference to my own humble work in the ministry. Nothing gives the pastor better assurance of the real success of his work than when his people seek him privately to ask the old momentous question, What must I do to be saved? or to tell him of some sin or sorrow that rests upon their hearts. Nothing so binds him to his people as this manifestation of confidence in his purity, sincerity, sympathy and wisdom. But when no one is moved or emboldened to unburden his heart to the pastor, it ought to be a source of profound concern to him. Has he been too cold? Has his preaching been unquickened by the Divine fire? Has his best thought been given to something else? Let him ponder. Let him cast himself upon his face before the Lord. God has made his ministers to be his ambassadors, not only to the congregation but to the soul. Ah, one soul to meet it alone, to lead it into light and peace—there is no grander work! The pastor will learn more of others, of himself, of the Bible, of grace, and of God in one personal interview than in weeks of study. He will be able to help that soul more in an hour than by years of preaching.

But some one will deny, perhaps, that while this personal consultation may be construed into what the Reformers called private confession, it has now-a-days nothing to do with what they called private absolution. Surely we have public confession and public absolution in the Morning Service every Sunday where the appointed order is used, and everywhere in the Preparatory Service before the Communion. And why should not the pastor or Christian brother give the same assurance of grace to the penitent in private as in public? No Methodist preacher or layman hesitates to do this at the altar or in the inquiry room. Absolution is after all but the application of the Gospel, the assurance of divine love and pardon and help, to the sorrowing heart. God forbid that we should cry peace, peace when there is not peace; but God forbid also that we should deny the cup of salvation to a thirsty soul.

ARTICLE V.

MELANCHTHON AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

In the article entitled, "Melanchthon and the Augsburg Confession," which appeared in the *QUARTERLY*, for July, 1897, we discussed for the most part the so-called "Torgau Articles," and the "Composition" of the Augsburg Confession. Very little was said about "the articles of faith," or about the Schwabach Articles, which furnished the *basis* for a *part* of the doctrinal articles of the Confession.

Subsequent study of the subject has confirmed the conviction expressed in our former article, that Melanchthon was led by Eck's little book of 404 propositions—"Eck has published the most diabolical slanders against us," says Melanchthon*—to change the purpose of preparing an "Apology," to the determination of preparing a "Confession," which should embrace "about all the articles of faith!" We have also inquired for the conclusions of recent German writers on this particular point of our Confession's history. Without a solitary exception, and without qualification, they affirm either that Eck's book induced a change of purpose, or, that which is equivalent, viz: that the "Apology" in its first form contained no articles of faith. After briefly describing Eck's book, Plitt says: "Melanchthon, who at Augsburg got hold of this writing, was induced by it, in order to meet the attack, to compose a brief summary of the fundamental doctrines of the Evangelical Church, and thus to refute the charge of teaching heresies."† Oehler says: "At Augsburg the writing ("Apology") had to be entirely rewritten, namely, with reference to the 404 articles which John Eck had at that time published, an anthology of errors, which Eck had gathered from the writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Oecolampodius, Carlstadt, Hubmeier, John Deuck and others, in order

*C. R. II, 45.

†Einleitung, I, 530.

that the Evangelicals might appear worse than the Turks. This at once forced Melanchthon to take into the Confession those articles with reference to which the Protestants had expressed their consensus with the Catholic Church. For this he employed the Schwabach Articles as a guide (Vonlage.)* Herman in the second edition of Oehler's *Symbolik*, says: "The first draft of 'the Apology,' as the Augsburg Confession was originally called, was begun by Melanchthon in Coburg, April 15-23, in the presence of Luther, and was taken by him to Augsburg almost or nearly finished. Yet this first draft, just like the Torgau Articles, did not contain any articles of faith."† Plitt in his *Grundriss der Symbolik*, 1888, says: "Melanchthon's Apology, begun on the journey, proved inadequate in the face of John Eck's slanders. The beginning of the Augsburg Confession as such on the basis of the preparation already named (Schwabach and Torgau Articles) was at Augsburg."‡ Kolde (1896) after describing Eck's book, says: "Thereupon Melanchthon resolved to include also the most important *articles of faith* in the 'Apology,' and, because the Emperor would have no time to hear long expositions, to give the whole more the form of a Confession."§ Nösgen (1897) makes Eck's book the occasion for Melanchthon's "giving the form of a Confession to the originally proposed Apology."|| Karl Müller (1895) says: "After the arrival at Augsburg it was necessary to add articles of faith in opposition to an attack of Eck, who had published a collection of 404 heretical articles of the Protestants, and had proposed a disputation. The required complete transformation of the 'Apology' into a Confession was made by Melanchthon between the 4th and 11th of May. The existing apologetic articles in ceremonies were changed, but especially were full doctrinal articles prefixed."¶

Virck says: "The Lutherans still held fast to the delusion that their adversaries conceded that there was no error in the Protestant *doctrine*. Yet the reception of articles of faith into the

**Symbolik*, 129.†*Ibid*, 128.

‡p. 16.

§Augsburg Konf., p. 4.

||*Symbolik*, p. 75.¶*Symbolik*, p. 225.

Confession took place, as Plitt has shown, only after that Melanchthon had been forced by Eck's attack to give up that delusion," (*Zeits für Kirchenges.* ix. 70-71). Köstlin says: "Eck's new attack had fully determined him (Melanchthon) to take all the chief articles of faith into the Confession." (*Martin Luther*, II., p. 206).

It will be seen that these specialists and historians of the Confession, do not argue the case. They assert outright that Eck's book was the occasion of an entire change of purpose in the mode of the Protestant defense before the Empire. Instead of an "apology" containing a discussion of ceremonies only, Melanchthon finds it necessary to prepare a "Confession."

Through the kindness of the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, we have been permitted to examine a copy of Eck's book, and have compared portions of it with portions of the Confession. We find the most unmistakable evidence that Melanchthon was so much influenced by that book, that it really forms the necessary presupposition to the right understanding of the doctrinal part of the Confession. There is absolutely no documentary evidence to show or even to intimate, that the "Apology" as written at Coburg, and as more fully elaborated up to May 4th,* contained a single article of faith. Why should it contain articles of faith? Had not the Protestants always insisted that they taught no doctrines contrary to the teachings of the Church Catholic, and that the entire contention had reference to the "ceremonies"? Did they not expressly so declare in the "Torgau Articles"? Would not the introduction of articles of faith into the "Apology" now cast suspicion on the declaration made in the "Torgau Articles," that the adversaries themselves had acknowledged that the doctrines taught in the electoral dominions (at Wittenberg) were Christian, and comforting, and without error? Why should Melanchthon change the purpose expressed in the "Torgau Articles," of treating only of "ceremonies," and now, even before the Diet has met, "bring together about all the articles of faith"?†

*C. R. II. 40, 41.

†C. R., II., 45.

VOL. XXVIII. No. 3.

45

The whole purview was changed by Eck's book of "most diabolical slanders." The Reformers were charged by Eck with promulgating horrid errors in doctrine. The "Apology" is changed into a "Confession" in order to "oppose a remedy to these slanders," as Melanchthon expressly says. The best way for the Protestants to meet the accusation, is to affirm their faith, and to connect that faith with the authoritative teaching of the Church. Moreover, they had promised in the "Torgau Articles," "to set forth the entire Christian doctrine," should it be demanded of them, in order to show that no heretical doctrines were taught among them. Surely the most imperative demand is now made by Eck's book.

Again: Why should Melanchthon add damnatory clauses to the articles of faith, and condemn the ancient and modern heretics, and "reject the opposite doctrine"? Nothing of this kind appears in the Schwabach Articles. All this was necessary now because Eck's book had associated the Reformers with those heretics, and had charged them in a lump with teaching "the opposite doctrine." They must disavow all such abnormal and fatal association. This can be done best by making simple and emphatic *rejection*.

These conclusions we reached after having learned the character of Eck's book, and especially after having read it. We had never before been able to understand what Melanchthon meant by "the most diabolical slanders" of which he writes to Luther, May 11th; and nowhere had we seen any explanation.* Melanchthon says that these slanders had been "published" by Eck. Where? in what form? In print? or *viva voce*? These were questions for which we could not obtain answers. Even after having seen Eck's book, the question arose, Did Melanchthon actually know of Eck's book? An affirmative answer to this

*We do not recall having seen any reference to Eck's book in any of the old histories of the Confession. It is quite probable that it had a very limited circulation, and was soon forgotten. It is noticed in Winter's *Kirchengeschichte von Baiern*, p. 269. If we mistake not Plitt was the first to bring it into prominence, and to show its influence on the Confession. It is an exceedingly rare book. It is altogether probable that Dr. Jacobs has the only copy in America.

question was the link needed to connect the "Confession," that is, "about all the articles of faith," historically with Eck's book. Research has brought the answer. Already in his letter to Luther, May 4th, Melanchthon wrote: *Eckius* qui geminatus, reddit vocem monedularum, Ek, Ek, Ek, Ek, magnum acervum conclusionum congegssit. Postulat a principibus, ut instituatur disputatio contra *Lutheranos* ;* that is, "*Eck*, the repetition of whose name sounds like the cackling of crows, has compiled a big batch of propositions. He requests the rulers to appoint a disputation against the *Lutherans*." Eck's book is exactly what Melanchthon here describes: "A big batch of propositions." In the title Eck had offered to discuss the propositions, just as Melanchthon here says. The historical connection is complete. Not later than two days after his arrival in Augsburg, Melanchthon had seen Eck's book, and with his own eyes he had read those "most diabolical slanders" published by Eck.

The entire theological situation was now changed. The Lutherans were attacked at the very point at which they thought they were invulnerable. An Apology that should treat only of ceremonies that had been changed, could not satisfy the new exigency. The Protestants must fortify themselves against the new attack. They must oppose a remedy to those "most diabolical slanders" of having introduced errors in doctrine, and of being the associates of heretics. Fortunately they did not have to go far in search of a *Vorlage* or basis of defense. It was an act of wisdom to select for this purpose the Schwabach Articles, which already bore the title: "Articles of the Elector of Saxony, concerning faith," composed by Luther, aided by Melanchthon and others. If we compare these Schwabach Articles with the corresponding articles of the finished Confession, we will not ask why they were not prefixed bodily to the "Apology" as the answer to Eck's slanders. They are at once discovered to be inadequate. In some places they contain superfluous matter; in other places they lack the necessary fulness. They are deficient in logical order, and their tone is too harsh. Besides, Luther's

*C. R. II, 39.

relation to them as their chief author, would have at once placed them under prejudice.

If we consider them in their history, and in their relation to Luther, we see the eminent propriety of Melanchthon's using them just as he did. The Confession was designed to be a representation of the faith taught in the Elector's dominions, and Luther was not to be ignored as the chief teacher of this faith. The end to be obtained, and the circumstances of the case, almost surely demanded that the preëxisting material should be used. For the same reasons the demand existed that this material should be entirely re-wrought. To adjust the old material to the new situation, to turn an "Apology" into a "Confession," was no small task. But the man was there, and he was the only man then living, who was equal to the demands of the situation; and in no transaction of his life did Melanchthon show greater tact than in the composition of the doctrinal portion of the Confession. In him we have combined in one person, the theologian, the historian, the logician and the rhetorician.

It will assist us very much in understanding Melanchthon's relation to the Confession, and also in understanding the Confession itself, if we can have placed before us the exact amount of the given material used by Melanchthon in the composition of the *first seventeen articles* of the Confession, for it was shown in the article of July, 1897, that all of the Confession that follows the seventeenth article is entirely Melanchthon's in origin and in composition. Happily, Dr. Knaake, one of the most learned Luther-scholars in the world, has made a word-for-word comparison of these seventeen articles with the Marburg and Schwabach articles. We transfer his work to our pages, giving in each article of the Confession the words for which, according to Knaake, Melanchthon is indebted to the sources indicated, though the impression made by the English translation is not so striking as is that made by the original German. Let the reader, in order to understand Knaake's representation, compare it with any English translation of the German Confession. It is to be understood also that all the articles and words found in the Confession and not found in Knaake's exhibit, are articles and

words supplied by Melanchthon. It is also to be understood that Knaake wrote his book to vindicate "Luther's part in the Confession," and that he distinctly declares, what no competent scholar would now presume to deny, viz., that Luther's part in the preparation for the Confession, was confined to the Marburg and Schwabach Articles.

I.* It is unanimously taught and held agreeably to the Decree of the Council of Nice, that there is only one divine essence * * is God; but that there are three persons in this one divine essence * * God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost * * one Creator * * of all things.

II.† * * Since * * of Adam * * are born in sin * * and this * * and original sin is truly sin and condemns all.

III.‡ * * That God the Son became man and was born of the pure Virgin Mary, * * inseparably united in one person, are one Christ, who is true God and true man, truly * * suffered, was crucified, died and was buried * * not only for original sin, but also for all other sins * * Arose from the dead on the third day, ascended to heaven, * * that he might perpetually reign over all creatures.

Will come to judge the living and the dead.

IV.§ * * That we cannot obtain forgiveness of sin and righteousness before God by our own merit, works; * * we obtain remission of sins and are justified before God * * for Christ's sake, if we believe that Christ suffered for us, and that for his sake our sins are remitted unto us, and righteousness and eternal life are bestowed. For God regards this faith and imputes it as righteousness in his sight, as St. Paul says in Rom. 3 and 4.

V.|| For the purpose of obtaining this faith God has instituted the ministry, * * the Gospel * * through which as means, he imparts the Holy Spirit * * in his own time and place, in those that hear the Gospel.

*Marb. 1. Schwab. 1. †Marb. 4. Schwab. 4 ‡Marb. 2, 3. Schwab. 2, 3, 4. §Marb. 5, 7. Schwab. 5. ||Marb. 6, 8. Schwab. 7.

VI.* * * That such faith must bring forth good fruit and good works.

VII.† * * That one holy Christian Church shall ever continue to exist, which is the * * of believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the * * sacraments are administered according to the Gospel.

VIII. * *

IX.‡ * * And that children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism became acceptable to God.

X.§ That the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under * * of bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper.

XI.|| * * Unnecessary to enumerate all * * sins.

XII¶ * * a faith which consoles and imparts peace to the heart. * *

XIII.** Use of the sacraments * * that the sacraments have been instituted * * as tokens * * externally * * for the purpose of exciting and strengthening our faith.

XIV. * *

XV.†† Concerning ecclesiastical rites instituted by men it is taught, that those should be observed which can be so observed without sin and which promote peace * * in the Church.

Wherefore monastic vows and other traditions concerning the difference of meats, days, &c., intended for the purpose of meriting grace.

XVI.‡‡ * * that all authority in the world, established government and laws are instituted of God, * * that Christians may hold office * * without sin.

XVII.§§ * * that on the last day our Lord Jesus Christ will come to judge, * * to give to the believing * * eternal life and to condemn impious men and devils to hell and everlasting punishment.

If now we study the originals and analyze Knaake's representation we find:

†Marb. 10. Schwab. 6, 8. Schwab. 12.

†Marb. 9, 14. Schwab. 9. ‡Marb. 15. Schwab. 10.

§Schwab. 11. ||Schwab. 11. ¶Marb. 15. Schwab. 8.

**Marb. 13. Schwab. 15, 17. ††Marb. 12. Schwab. 14. ‡‡Schwab. 13.

1. That there are no antecedents for articles VIII, and XIV. In other words, these articles are Melanchthon's in origin and in sentiment. In the seventh article the conception of the Church differs already considerably from that given in Article XII. of the Schwabach series. "The Holy Christian Church is the assembly of believers," "the congregation of saints." Stress is laid on the quality of holiness or sanctity. This is the ideal Church. In Article VIII. Melanchthon describes the Church as it is, and affirms the objective validity of the sacraments as independent of the subjective condition of the administrant. Without this article, the Confession would forever lie open to the charge of being Donatistic. Hence the very great importance of this article.

Article XIV. was added in the interest of good order in the administration of the means of grace. But it limits the orderly administration to the *rite vocatus*. It says not one word about ordination. Hence the Lutheran Church has never held that ordination is essential to the pure preaching of the Gospel, or to the valid administration of the sacraments; and as a matter of fact ordination was not bestowed in Württemberg until 1855.

2. That only a few words have passed from the Marburg and Schwabach articles into each of Articles I., II., VI., XI., XII., of the Augustana. Melanchthon's direct influence on these articles is undeniable.

3. That the damnatory classes and everything that appeals to the teaching of the early Church, Article 1., excepted, are new in the Confession. The *rejectionia* are of the highest importance under the circumstances. They serve to dissociate the Lutherans from heretics and fanatics. The appeal to history connects the Lutherans with the Church Catholic. At this point Melanchthon has most beneficially influenced the Confession. It is this quality of historicity which renders the Confession so prominently conservative.

4. That Articles IX. and X. are much shorter than they appear in their respective originals. That which is truly characteristic of Article IX. in the Confession, viz., that baptism is "necessary," — of course a *necessitas de precepto* —, and that by

it grace is offered, does not appear in the Marburg and Schwabach series. In the Confession Baptism is treated much more as a *means of grace*, that is, as a medium through which grace is offered. This is clearly expressed in the *thesis*, and implied in the *antithesis*. In point of clearness and didactic quality Article IX. of the Confession greatly surpasses its antecedents. It does not teach a different doctrine of Baptism, but it exhibits the Lutheran doctrine more objectively than its antecedents do. Its defect is that it does not affirm the necessity of faith to appropriate the grace that is offered in Baptism. But this deficiency is supplied by Article XIII., which rejects the *opus operatum* and affirms the necessity of faith.

In Article X. Melanchthon meant to set forth the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He wrote to Veit Dietrich, June 26th: "The Landgrave has subscribed the Confession with us. Its article of the Lord's Supper is in accordance with *Luther's* view."* But the statement is generic. The formula peculiar to Luther: "In the bread and in the wine," is supplanted by: "Under the form of bread and wine," which according to a correct Lutheran interpretation, affirms the presence of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord. What Melanchthon meant to set forth by the article as a whole, is clear from the Apology: "The tenth article is approved, in which we confess that we hold that *in the Supper of the Lord the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly presented with these things that are seen, bread and wine to those who receive the Sacrament.*" In repeating the explanation, a little further on, he adds: "And we speak of the presence of the Living Christ." More and more did Melanchthon in later years emphasize the *presence of the Living Christ*, and explain the sacrament in accordance with the central Lutheran thought that the sacrament is a sign of *promised grace*, and brings the pardon of sin to all those who receive it with faith. But neither he nor Luther ever laid the chief stress on the *real presence*, nor on *bodily presence*, nor on *ubiquity*. Hence Dr. Jacobs is entirely correct when he

*C. R. II., 142. Melanchthon was as much opposed to Zwingli's doctrine as Luther was.

writes: "Given and shed for you for the remission of sins." Even the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is entirely subordinate to those words of the Lord's Supper. These heavenly gifts only seal the promise of the Gospel.* The essential thing is the forgiveness of sins. This was as resolutely maintained by Melanchthon as by Luther, and is principally involved in Melanchthon's celebrated aphorisms, so loudly applauded by Luther: "Christ is present not on account of the bread, but on account of man. Nothing has the nature of a sacrament apart from the use appointed by Christ."

5. That by actual enumeration in the German, if we have not miscounted, we find that only 438 words passed from the Marburg and Schwabach articles into the first seventeen articles of the Confession, which in these articles contains 1682 words; that is, nearly three fourths of the words of these seventeen articles are the words of Melanchthon, though it is not to be concluded that the influence of either Luther or Melanchthon in these seventeen articles, can be thus mathematically determined. But such an enumeration does show to a demonstration that Melanchthon used his materials in an entirely independent way, that they formed only the *basis*, or as Oehler says, the *Vorlage* of this part of the Confession. The *foundation* of this part of the Confession is Luther's but the *superstruction* is Melanchthon's, and whatever superiority—and who can estimate its greatness?—which the Confession has over the Schwabach articles is due to Melanchthon. Nor is this superiority confined to the form. It also enters into the contents, as Knaake's exhibit abundantly shows.

6. That Melanchthon made such changes in the use of his materials, by omissions, and additions, by the introduction of new thoughts and new articles, as cannot be described by words. These changes constitute no small part of the substance of the Confession, and help to make it what it is.

So much may be said of the first seventeen articles of the Confession. But it cannot and must not be said that these articles

*Elements of Religion, p. 164.

are Melancthonian in the sense in which the word *Melancthonism*, or the word *Philipism*, was used a generation later, when parties were formed, and when some of Melancthon's scholars had perverted and misdeveloped Melancthon's teaching; neither can nor must it be said that these articles are *Lutheran*, in the sense in which *Luther's doctrine* was used when men more Lutheran than Luther, took "Holy Father Luther" as their shibboleth, and sought to make Luther's private opinions, uttered often in the heat of controversy, normative for Lutheran teaching, and binding in the Lutheran Church.

So much may be said of the first seventeen articles of the Confession. Of the so-called doctrinal articles, there remain yet Articles: XVIII., Of Free Will; XIX., Of the Cause of Sin; XX., Of Faith and Good Works; XXI., Of the Worship of Saints, together with the Conclusion—in all, in extent of matter, nearly one half of the doctrinal part. Of these four articles it is not even pretended that there are antecedents in the Schwabach Articles. They are purely of Melancthonian authorship. Their importance and value in their place cannot be called in question.

1. In his controversy with Erasmus—*De Servo Arbitrio*—Luther had taught the *absolute* bondage of the will, as Melancthon had done in the first edition of his *Loci*, 1521. They both had affirmed that there is no such thing as free will. Luther never renounced this determinism, though in after years he let it drop into the background. Melancthon was convinced by the arguments of Erasmus that the will has freedom in things pertaining to nature, that is, that the will can and does exercise the power of choice in things comprehended by reason. In his commentary on Colossians, 1527, he denies that God is the author of sin, and says expressly that "the human will has freedom in choosing those things which belong to nature, as to choose this or that kind of food. It also has the power to work natural and civil righteousness, as abstaining from murder, from theft and from another man's wife."* The same doctrine is expressed in the Visitation Articles (1527) in almost the same words.† But

*Galle, p. 274.

†C. R. XXVI. 26, 78.

in both treatises he firmly maintains that the will has no power to obey the law of God, or to work spiritual righteousness. Article XVIII. of the Confession contains the same doctrine in almost the same identical verbal form, which shows that Melanchthon had a very definite conception of the doctrine of the will. It is also worthy of remark that Melanchthon begins the article with the words: *De libero arbitrio* whereas Luther's treatise is entitled: *De Servo Arbitrio*. That Melanchthon's doctrine of the will, as it is expressed in the Commentary on Colossians, in the Visitation Articles, and in the Confession, is the doctrine of the Lutheran Church on that most important subject, no one will for a moment call in question. Hence that the Lutheran Church is not, in the most extreme sense, Augustinian, in its doctrine of the will, is due to Melanchthon.

2. Article XIX. is taken almost literally from the Commentary on Colossians. Even the quotation, John 8 : 44, is the same in both.* Melanchthon either had the Commentary before him when he wrote this article, or he had the thoughts and the words definitely fixed in his mind, since it actually differs as little from the passage in the Commentary as any one of the first seventeen articles differs from its Schwabach antecedent.

In the *Loci* of 1521 Melanchthon had virtually, if not actually, proclaimed God the author of sin, when he wrote: "All things that occur, occur necessarily by the divine appointment. Our will has no freedom."† The same conclusion is involved in Luther's denial of contingency, and in his affirmation "That all which we do, and all which happens, although it seems to happen mutably and contingently, does in reality happen necessarily and unalterably, in so far as respects the will of God."‡ With the recognition of *contingency* and of the freedom of the will, Melanchthon must necessarily seek the cause of sin in the will of those who abuse their freedom. In some theological fragments of the year 1533, and in the new edition of the *Loci* of 1535, he very positively affirms contingency, and continues to lodge the cause of sin with the will of the devil and of man.

3. Article XX., Of Faith and Good Works, is an explanation

*Galle, 276.

†C. R. XXI., 88.

‡Lat. Op., 7, 134.

and exposition of the Fourth Article. It formed no part of "the first draft" of the Confession sent to Luther, May 11th. Unquestionably it has its immediate antecedent in an article of the same title, prepared by Melanchthon about June 3rd and still preserved.* Again and again does the Article deny the meritoriousness of works, and affirm that faith alone justifies; but it inculcates the duty of performing good work because of the will of God. Nothing that Melanchthon ever wrote is more purely his than this Article. Luther never saw it until after the Confession had been presented to the Emperor. Moreover, it more than any other article, illustrates the ethical principle which guided Melanchthon in all his theological activity. "I am certain that in teaching theology my only object has been to make men better."†

4. Article XXI. is no doubt based on an article entitled: Of the Worship of Saints, contained in the so-called Torgau Articles.‡ It was written just a few days before the delivery of the Confession. Its full Melanchthonian origin is assured.

This analysis of the Confession shows Melanchthon's part in the preparation of the Augsburg Confession. That he is the author of the four last articles mentioned above, author in the highest sense of authorship, is simply demonstrable. No one would even pretend that Luther wrote a line that appears in these four articles. Equally certain is it that Articles VIII. and XIV. are of pure Melanchthonian origin. Melanchthon's hand is also visible in each and every one of the other fifteen articles. His relation to the articles on Abuses was shown in the *QUARTERLY* for July 1897. There is not a single syllable of documentary evidence to show that Luther wrote a single line of the so-called Torgau Articles, which formed the *basis*, and only the *basis*, of the articles on Abuses. The German specialists are as unanimous in excluding Luther from the authorship of these Articles as they are unanimous in affirming their Melanchthon-

*See C. R. IV., 1005. Förstemann, I., 94. Jacobs' Book of Concord, II., 86. †C. R., I., 722.

‡Jacobs' Book of Concord, II., 85. See *Zeitschrift für Kircheng.* 1865, pp. 576, 610.

ian authorship.* Melanchthon took this material, furnished by himself, and by unnumbered transformations, eliminations and additions, he built upon it the articles on Abuses, which at that time were regarded as the more important part of the Confession; for he himself says in the closing paragraph of the doctrinal part: "The controversy and contention principally refer to traditions and abuses."

Who then is the author of the Augsburg Confession? The facts of its history force the conclusion that such honor belongs to Melanchthon exactly in the sense in which it is said that Shakspeare is the author of "Julius Cæsar," that Milton is the author of "Paradise Lost," that Gibbon is the author of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." Each of these three great authors had certain materials in hand. Each arranged the materials in a manner peculiar to himself and adapted to the end in view, added new thoughts, and gave the whole the impress of his own genius. Each produced something new, something which did not previously exist, though not *absolutely* original in its matter, since absolute originality does not appear in any human author—it is not found in the theology of Luther, nor in that of Augustine, nor in that of Paul. Luther's theology is that of Augustine, of Thomas Aquinas, of Peter Lombard, with certain eliminations and evangelical additions.

At Augsburg Melanchthon brought into summary statement the doctrines common to the evangelical theologians,—the doctrines which he had exhibited in the *Loci* and in the Visitation Articles, and which are found in his own and in Luther's various doctrinal discussions, and in Luther's sermons and postils. As we know from his repeated affirmations, it was not his design to originate any new doctrine, but to re-state the doctrines of the Catholic Church of Christ. This confessional re-statement of the chief doctrines of Christianity, was something as distinctly new in the life and history of the Reformation, as the Constitution of the United States was something new in the life and history of a great nation. The Confession created a great ecclesiastical body, just as the Constitution may be said to have

*See LUTH. QUARTERLY for July, 1897, pp. 305-10.

created a great nation. It cannot be denied that the Augsburg Confession, taken as a whole, and as a conception, is vastly different from the Schwabach Articles, vastly different from any creed or confession that had ever existed, vastly different from anything antecedently written by either Luther or Melanchthon—something wholly *sui generis*, though Melanchthon had written the "Torgau Articles."

Chiefly dogmaticians, or those who have reflected the dogmatic mind, or those who have borrowed the Flacian calumniation, or those who have superficially examined the facts, have sought to give Melanchthon a subordinate place in the preparation and composition of the Augsburg Confession. Quite different is the conclusion reached by those Lutheran historians who have taken counsel of the facts, and have allowed the facts their just weight. Matthes, who wrote a life of Melanchthon, and also an excellent work on Symbolics, says: "Perhaps no writing ever gave its author so much solicitude as this, in which every sentence and every word, was most carefully pondered."* Dr. Carl Schmidt, Melanchthon's most learned and impartial biographer, after following the composition of the Confession step by step from the beginning to the finish, says: "Such is the Augsburg Confession, which has become so famous in history. Although it was discussed by all the theologians present; although even the civil counselors and the delegates added their word, and the Saxon Chancellor especially knew how 'to arrange it before and behind,' yet was it very especially the work of Melanchthon, and belongs to the most important he wrote. Everywhere it bears the impress of his spirit. With astonishing clearness and simplicity it presents the doctrine. Scholastic subtlety and terminology are avoided, so that it can be understood even by the most unlearned, nor is it susceptible of being misunderstood or falsely interpreted. In vain would you seek a trace of a mind filled with hate, or even acting under excitement. The calmness and moderation with which the whole is

**Symbolik* p. 56. See also the Life, p. 121, in which he says: "Diese Schrift von Melanchthon ganz allein verfassten," and note: "From May 11th to June 24th Luther was not again consulted."

treated must take from opponents all pretext for complaint of unnecessary violence. All the doctrines are led back in the most logical way to the fundamental principle of justification by faith, and the same principle furnishes the rule by which to judge of ceremonies."*

Weber wrote the most critical and exact history of the Confession that has ever been penned. He says: "Now is the time to examine the question: Is Melanchthon to be regarded as the author of the Augsburg Confession? After what I have already written touching the manner and method by which he prepared the Confession, the question may be regarded as settled. For if he is the author of a writing to whom the matter and wording belong, or if in a manner peculiar to himself he has worked up the materials found at hand, how can the authorship of the Confession be denied Melanchthon? Grant that he had before him the materials in the seventeen Schwabach Articles, or as I have shown above, those of Electoral Saxony, and the essays on religion furnished by the other theologians, did he not elaborate them in an original manner, and from the seed produce the beautiful tree with its shady branches and fruit? Is La Fontaine or Racine or Corneille to be disparaged, because the first borrowed his materials mostly from other fabalists, and the others from history? Or to give another illustration: Will anyone dare to say, without blushing, that Mascov, Bunau and Schmidt are not authors, but that they only brought the drafts and materials of history into a particular form? Such is the note which so many theologians and historians of the Augsburg Confession, former and recent, strike since the composition of the Bergic Form of Concord. Men have been at great pains and have invented empty arguments to circumscribe Melanchthon's part in the production of the Augsburg Confession, to depreciate his work, and to reduce it to a clerkship. Melanchthon is not to be called the author of the Augsburg Confession, but is regarded as having brought it into a particular form out of the seventeen articles, which the illustrious man of God, Herr Luther had previously drawn up? Luther, Jonas and

*Philip Melanchthon, p. 207.

Bugenhagen wrought with Melanchthon on the Confession before he went to Torgau—Luther sent memoranda to Augsburg—Jonas translated the Confession into German, (which translation is to be greatly preferred to the original Latin) and gave Melanchthon opportunity still further to change his Latin draft, and to express its contents better—these and similar fancies, borrowed either from a false historical conception, or being absolutely without historical foundation, are the hollow echoes of the anti-Philipistic times, when Luther's zealous disciples envied and disparaged Melanchthon's fame. And I reckon it among the consequences of the Bergic Form of Concord, to which as to a symbolically binding treatise on the doctrines defined in it, I accord full right, that since that time, it has been the fashion to belittle and dispare the merit of Melanchthon.*

Planck, whose profound researches entitle his opinions to the greatest weight, says. "By May 11th, Melanchthon had finished a complete draft. This the Elector sent on that date to Luther at Coburg. But that draft was changed so much from time to time up almost to the moment of delivery, by additions and omissions, by elaboration and the introduction of entirely new articles, that a wholly different work arose, to which, however, the Torgau Articles furnished the foundation. It may be that Melanchthon was led to some of these changes and additions by the drafts brought to Augsburg by the theologians of the other Protestant estates. Yet he did not make so much use of them, that it can be said that he only compiled the Confession out of these different essays. It is also true that the judgment of the other theologians was passed upon each finished part of the work (see Camerarius, *Vita Mel.* ed. Strobel, p. 120), but it would not only be wrong, but foolish to say that the finished Confession is not his work, but the joint work of those theologians. Yet such foolishness has been indulged in by the man's enemies."†

Schöppf, in his "Symbolical Books," writes: "The modest Melanchthon counseled with the other theologians who were

*Krit. Hist. I., 47, 48. †3: 41, n.

present at Augsburg, and with Luther who had remained at Coburg, yet he especially was the author, and only he with his gentleness was qualified for the work," p. 26.

Times almost without number did Melanchthon speak of himself as the author of the Augsburg Confession, and the claim was never disputed while he lived. Camerarius wrote: "The entire burden was imposed on him and borne by him."* John Brentz wrote at Augsburg, June 24th, 1530: *Conscriptimus enim auctore Philippo Melancthone epitomen doctrinae nostrae.*† Those who buried Melanchthon inscribed on the lid of his coffin: *Auctor Confessionis Augustanae.*

But when Melanchthon and his Augsburg associates had passed away, and a generation of passionate zealots had come into place, who were more intent on their own interpretation of the Confession, than upon ascertaining the truth of its history, it became the fashion to disparage Melanchthon in the Church which he helped to create, and to name Luther the author of the matter, of the contents, of the Confession, and to call Melanchthon the author of its *form*, of its *rhetoric*, of its *style*: that is, the profound scholar, the accomplished writer, the learned theologian, the trusted counselor of princes, did the work of an amanuensis at Augsburg! The *πρώτον φῆνδος* once started, it suited the taste and temper of a dogmatic age to keep it moving, though there have always been those who had the manly courage to protest against the great injustice—an injustice which his bitterest personal enemies, like Amsdorf, Flacius, Wigand, did not even dare to intimate.

Happily during the last sixty or seventy years the materials for a correct history of the Augsburg Confession have been accumulating; historical criticism has done its noble work, and we are far enough away from the rivalries and strifes of the sixteenth century to regard the heroes of Augsburg with clearer vision than the Epigoni could employ, who were compelled to work in the shadows of those mighty men who made the 25th

*Vita Mel. p. 126. †C. R. II., 124. See C. R. X. 248; C. R. IX. 260.

impossible to communicate with Luther, except to send him "the finished draft" of what he had written, and to inquire for his criticism. In that Confession he presented the essentials of Luther's teaching, not because he desired to represent, or to reproduce, Luther, but because he believed that such was the teaching of the divine Word and of the Catholic Church. He was not willing to be the author of a new dogma. This we have in his own words, (Tom. III., 687). He even wished to draw so near to the Roman Church that the opposite party could find no fault with the Lutherans. This he expressed both officially and privately. In the Epilogue to the first part of the Confession, he says that the Confession contains "nothing contrary to the Scriptures, or to the Catholic Church, or to the Roman Church in so far as it is known from the writers." On the sixth of July (1530) he wrote to Cardinal Campegius: "We have no doctrine different from the Roman Church," and: "On no other account do we suffer more hate in Germany than because with the greatest constancy we defend the doctrine of the Roman Church. This fidelity to Christ and to the Roman Church we will show, God willing, to the last breath, (even though you should refuse to receive us into favor.) It is only a trifling difference in rites which seems to stand in the way of reconciliation"* On the same day he wrote to the Cardinal by command of the Princes, saying that the Princes "allowed no articles to be taught which depart from the Scriptures and from the Catholic Church; that privately they discharge their obligated duty to his most Reverend Lordship, and promise, publicly, so far as it can be done with a good conscience, to accept such conditions as shall be judged proper for retaining, confirming and maintaining peace and harmony. And they affirm that they are perfectly willing to retain the ecclesiastical order and the lawful authority of the bishops."†

When it is remembered that the Cardinal was the Papal Legate to the Diet, and hence virtually, the Pope himself, there can be no misunderstanding of these letters of Melanchthon. They show at least that it was his intention, and as well

*C. R. II., 170,

†C. R. II., 172.

that of the Princes, to disturb the recognized articles of doctrine and the existing ecclesiastical order as little as possible. Perhaps Melancthon's whole mind is best expressed in his own words: "When at Augsburg anno 30 I had to compose the first Confession; when no one would write a letter, though the Emperor assuredly wanted and demanded a Confession, with sincerity of purpose I drew up the sum of doctrine; and omitted certain unnecessary and controverted questions, in order that every one might know what the Cardinal doctrine (*Hauptlehre*) of these Churches is."* It was then the *Cardinal* doctrines, not those that were personally characteristic, that Melancthon sought to set forth.

Hence the Confession is *Generic* in character. It is neither *Lutheran* nor *Melancthonian* in any personal or partisan sense, in the sense in which *Lutheranism* and *Melancthonism* came to be understood and spoken of in after years, when the two zealous disciples of each, separated that which God had joined in ten, February 16th, 1565: "I brought together, therefore, in their masters.

Two things are documentarily certain:

1. The Confession is by no means what Luther would have made it, had the pen been placed in his hand instead of in Melancthon's. June 29th, four days after the delivery of the Confession, he wrote to Melancthon: "So far as I am concerned too much has been conceded in that Apology" (Confession)† July 21st he wrote to Jonas: "Satan still lives, and he well knew that your Apology *Leisetreterin* cloaked (dissimulasse) the articles of purgatory, of the worship of saints, and especially of the Pope as Antichrist."‡ It has been well said that Luther's Augsburg Confession is the "Admonition to the ministers assembled at the Diet of Augsburg," which reached Augsburg early in June, and which in spirit and in content is vastly different from the Augsburg Confession written by Melancthon. *Erl. Ed.*, 24, 356.

2. The Augsburg Confession is not what Melancthon would have made it, had he been allowed his own way fully. To Camerarius he wrote, June 26th: "I changed and recast many

*C. R. IX., 990.

†De Wette IV., 52.

‡Ibid, IV., 110.

things daily, and would have changed more, had our counselors permitted." He regarded the Confession as too harsh, and feared lest the adversaries should be offended by the independence exhibited by the Protestants.*

At Augsburg Melanchthon was in a high degree the common consciousness, the surrogate of his party. His prime object, and doubtless the prime object of the entire body of counseling Protestants, was to present, not Luther's *specific* teaching, but the teaching of the Churches of the subscribing Princes and cities who were following the Lutheran movement in regard to doctrine and ceremonies, without binding themselves to an endorsement of every private view of Luther. It was their own Confession, and that of their Churches, that they were making through Melanchthon. At the same time it was determined to make this Confession, as Melanchthon's own words witness, in harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures, and with that of the Catholic Church and the Roman Church.†

That the Confession is better, and is better suited to its intended purpose, than Luther alone could have made it; that it is likewise better than Melanchthon could have made it, uncounseled; will not be disputed by any one who has studied the characters of the two men. Safety lay in the multitude of counselors. The Confession is a Lutheran Confession. It contains a summary of Lutheran doctrine freed from personal characteristics and private forms of expressions, and presented in its Cardinal features. To understand it aright, recourse must be had to the writings alike of Luther and Melanchthon. No one-sided or exclusive interpretation can be just. To interpret Articles XVIII. and XIX. according to Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* would

*C. R. II., 140.

†The day before the Confession was delivered Brentz wrote to Isenmann: "In ea (Confessione) petunt principes, ut amice controversio componatur, at pax constituatur," C. R. II., 125. Ranke writes that Melanchthon drew up the Confession "in the undeniable intention of approximating as closely as possible to the Catholic doctrines," *Hist. Reformation*, V., IX. Plitt notices that Chancellor Brück in his *History of the Diet of Augsburg*, named the Princes, "Princes of the Gospel" and "repudiated the expression 'Lutheran' as sectarian." *Einleitung I.*, 554.

be to read into them the most absolute *determinism*. To interpret Article X. by Luther's Large Confession alone would be to read into it *ubiquity* and *oral manducation*, neither of which is generic in the Lutheran doctrine, nor *necessary* to the doctrine of the real presence; nor is either contained in the Visitation Articles, which received the hearty approbation of Luther and Bugenhagen. To interpret the Confession fairly and honestly, one should study it in the light of Luther's Commentary on Galatians, of his Babylonian Captivity, his Freedom of the Christian Man, his eight sermons preached immediately after returning from the Wartburg, his *De Servo Arbitrio*, his Large Confession, his two Catechisms, to which must be added Melancthon's *Loci*, his numerous *Opinions*, his Visitation Articles, his commentaries on Matthew, Colossians, and Romans, and the Apology. These furnish a general view, the contents, of the Wittenberg teaching, which, after the elimination, as shown by Melancthon's own declaration, of what was personally characteristic, and controversial, was condensed in the Confession. This, and not the private views and opinions of either Luther or Melancthon, was the faith of the subscribers of the Confession. It is this its generic Lutheran character which imparts to the Confession, its value and significance as an ecclesiastical document. Luther could speak of it as "our Confession which our Philip hath prepared,"* and Melancthon could subscribe and reaffirm it to the day of his death, as his own composition, as the work of his own hands, and as the Confession of his faith.† Hence it has become, and it alone is fitted to be, the one sole identifying Lutheran symbol. It made, marks and defines the Lutheran Church as such. Other Confessions, superimposed upon it, have bound together families of Lutherans, but have at the same time separated them from other Lutherans. Hence the Augsburg Confession stands for Lutheran catholicity; other Confessions having a Lutheran name, stand for Luther *particularity*, and are to-day the prime cause of division and strife in parts of the Lutheran Church, and that, chiefly because they have led to the interpretation of Lutheranism from the standpoint

*De Wette IV. 69.

†C. R. IX., 260, 266, 279.

of Luther's controversial writings, and have sought to exclude the Melanchthonian influence, as well as the Melanchthonian name, from the fundamental Lutheran Confession, which gave birth to the Lutheran Church in 1530, saved it from the sword in 1555, and procured for it international recognition in 1648.

In the preparation of this Confession Melanchthon labored assiduously till the very hour of its delivery. Nor did his interest in it cease when it passed into the hands of the Emperor. The publication by avaricious book-sellers of one Latin and six German editions of the Confession, threw upon its author the duty of publishing an edition both in Latin and German, prepared by his own hand. This was done not by command of the Elector, but on his own authority. Hence as Dr. Zöckler says: "The authentic edition prepared by him has not the significance of an official act of the Evangelical Estates. Primarily it proceeds only from the interest of the author, which in this case corresponds essentially to that of the evangelical party."* This edition was also, "especially in the German text, changed in many places."† This edition appeared in print already in the Autumn of 1530. In the following Spring it was published in connection with the Apology, and is known as the *Editio Princeps*. The original title is:

C O N F E S S I O F I D E I

exhibita inuictis. Imp. Carolo V.

Caesari Aug. in Comicijs

Augustae,

Anno

M. D. XXX.

Addita est Apologia Confessionis.

Beide, Deutsch
und Lateinisch.

*Augsb. Con. p. 33. Noesgen, Symbolik, p. 80. Müller, Symbolik, p. 252.
†Oehler, Symbolik, p. 132.

Psalm. 119.

Et loquebar de testimonijs tuis in conspectu Regum, & non confundebat.

W I T E B E R G A E.

There is a copy with this title in the Royal Library at Dresden, on the first page of which Melancthon wrote with his own hand: *De Doctori Martino. Et Rogo ut legat et emendet.**

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

P. S. We had well-nigh finished writing the article printed above when our attention was called to an article in the January number of the *Lutheran Church Review*, entitled: "On the Genesis of the Augsburg Confession." By Rev. John A. W. Haas. As the article professes to be "an examination of 'Melancthon on the Augsburg Confession' by Professor J. W. Richard, D. D. (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, July, 1897)," we read it with much interest.

Our gratification with the article was exactly equal to our disappointment. We were gratified to find that Mr. Haas had not impeached the correctness, completeness and applicability of a single one of our translations and quotations,† and that he had not accused us of suppressing any documentary or other lawful information touching the genesis of the Augsburg Confession. This is a silent, but eloquent endorsement of our work. We are sorry that we cannot return the compliment, for it is more important that Mr. Haas should know the truth than that he should be titillated by a compliment.

*C. R. XXVI, 235.

†In a foot-note, p. 26, Mr. Haas has had the grace to insinuate that we had invented a quotation from Köstlin (LUTH. QUART. July, 1897, p. 318, n.), because he could not find it. In Köstlin's *Martin Luther*, vol. II., Elberfeld, 1875, p. 626, there it stands: "This letter from Luther (May 15th, 1530) to the Elector, with one of even date to Melancthon, reached Augsburg, May 22nd." Will Mr. Haas have the grace to make the *amende honorable* as publicly as he has made the insinuation of invention?

We were disappointed that Mr. Haas did not answer a single one of our inquiries for information (notes pp. 310, 316-17 LUTH. QUART., 1897). It is very evident that *he* had no answers to give.

1. We here and now assert without fear of refutation, that there is no documentary authority witnessing to the sending of the XVII. Schwabach Articles to Torgau, March 20th, or at any other time; that there is no documentary authority for the statement put forth by Dr. Krauth (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 219) that Luther was the "chief author" of "a special writing" known as "the *Torgau Articles proper*." It is most probable, and is a rational conclusion from the Torgau Articles (LUTH. QUART., 1897, pp. 301-2), that the Schwabach Articles were not sent to Torgau to become a part of the required *Gutachten*. All that Mr. Haas can say on this point is that this or that "may be," "may well have been." Yes, it "may be," it "may well have been." But *was* it—? Is Mr. Haas reciting history, or is he soliloquizing "Maud Muller"? His utter failure to present a single line of documentary evidence as required by our interrogatories, amounts to a complete surrender on his part. Mr. Haas knows that historical criticism is unanimous in excluding Luther from the authorship of the "Torgau Articles proper" (see LUTH. QUART., 1897, p. 309), and from the authorship of the whole of the antecedent materials out of which Melanchthon composed the second part of the Augsburg Confession. That Luther offered suggestions is probable; but this is very different from being "the chief author." Mr. Haas has not even dared to show that Luther's part in the Confession extends beyond Article XVII.

Mr. Haas has given no reason why such eminent German specialists as Weber, Pfaff, Schmidt, Kolde, *et al.*, should not interpret *daneben* by *am Rande*, that is, "on the margin;" and he has not shown why Dr. Krauth should translate it "at the same time;" (see LUTH. QUART., 1897, p. 316). In a question of the meaning of a German word we prefer the consensus of generations of German scholars.

We were disappointed also in discovering that Mr. Haas has not added a single new fact, and that he has not in any way enlarged the stock of our knowledge, in regard to the genesis of the Augsburg Confession. We will not say that his "whole article is colored by subjective preconceptions, personal likes and dislikes;" no, we will not apply to him his own expletives; but we will say and do say, that his whole article reads like a "back number," and that it reminds us of Mrs. Lincoln Phelps's "Chemistry," which we picked up the other day, after having laid it down more than thirty years ago.

In the name of the pragmatism of history, Mr. Haas seeks to establish utterly exploded theories. Notwithstanding the overwhelming facts to the contrary, Mr. Haas thinks it is still possible to believe, that is, for Mr. Haas to believe—*credat Apella Judaeus*—that Luther is the principal author of the Augsburg Confession, and that there was a *second* and a *third* sending of the Confession to Luther at Coburg before its presentation, June 25th.

1. As to the authorship of the Augsburg Confession in every fair and legitimate use of the word *authorship* we refer to the body of the present article and to our article in this *QUARTERLY* for July, 1897. In this matter we are as little the disciple of Rückert and of Heppe, as we are of Haas. Our investigations have been conducted in equal independence of all three.

2. Mr. Haas tries to prove his theory of a *second* sending by Chytraeus' Latin History of the Confession. The fallacy of resting an argument on that History we exposed in our former article (p. 319, n). We have before us, as we write, four editions (1576, editio princeps, '77, '80, '99) of the German Chytraeus. Not one of them says one word about a *second* sending. They say that after the sending of May 11th, Melanchthon continued to change the Confession and to improve it, "as he himself wrote to Dr. Luther a few days later, May 22nd"; and in proof of this, Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd is given in a German translation. So much for the German Chytraeus.

In 1577 Coelestin published his history of the Augsburg Confession in Latin. After mentioning the sending of May

11th, and giving some other historical matter, he says: *Etsi autem, ut paulo ante dictum est, Luthero probata fuit forma Confessionis Augustæ retexta: Tamen quotidie Philippus quaedam in ea mutavit, & circumspectius & exquisitius singula explicere & polire conatus est, sicut ipse aliquot diebus post exemplum Luthero remittens, scribit 22, die Maii. f. 43b.* That is: "But although, as has just been said, the draft of the Confession revised at Augsburg, was approved by Luther, nevertheless Philip daily changed certain things in it and strove the more carefully and exactly to explain and improve particular things, as he himself some days later sending a copy to Luther again, writes, May 22nd." In proof of all this he subjoins Melanchthon's letter in the original Latin. The only paragraph of the letter which makes any reference whatever to the Confession is the following: "In the *Apology* we daily change many things. The article on *Vows* which was too short I have supplanted by another longer discussion on the same subject. I am now treating on the power of the keys. I wish you would run over the articles of faith. Should you find nothing defective in these, we will treat the rest in some way. For they must be changed and adapted to circumstances." C. R., II., 60.

It will be seen that there is not one word here that implies or even intimates a sending of the Confession, or of any part of it, to Luther at that time. The letter manifestly proceeds on the supposition that Luther has a copy of the Confession in his hands, as indeed he may have had, since the "Apology" had been sent him in both Latin and German.* It is impossible to believe that Melanchthon would send a second copy without mentioning it. Hence it is unqualifiedly gratuitous for Coelestin to write about a *second* sending and to refer to Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd as proof of such sending. Luther's letter of May 15th announcing his gratification with "Master Philip's Apology," may have reached the Elector at Augsburg, May 22nd. We know that it and the "Apology" were there two days later. Knaake and Engelhardt have given the most satis-

*C. R., II., 51.

factory reasons (ignored by Mr. Haas) for believing that Melanchthon *did not know* that the "Apology" had been returned when he wrote, May 22nd.* It rests with Mr. Haas to show that Melanchthon *knew*, May 22nd, that the copies of the "Apology," Latin and German, which had been sent to Luther, May 11th, had been returned to Augsburg, and that on that day, May 22nd, Melanchthon sent a copy of the "Apology" again to Luther. In the utter absence of fact and of any intimation to that effect, it does not rest with us to show that he did not know of the return of those copies of the "Apology," and that he did not send it again. Before Mr. Haas can expect us to accept his assumption in the face of strong reasons to the contrary, he must give stronger reasons or produce facts. In reality he has done neither.

The most charitable thing we can say of Coelestin in this matter, is, that he either misread or misunderstood Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd.

In 1878 Chytraeus' Latin History of the Augsburg Confession was published. On p. 32 we read: *Etsi autem tunc a Luthero probata fuit forma Confessionis Augustæ retexta: tamen quotidie Philippus quaedam in ea mutavit & circumspicius ac exquisitius singula explicare & polire conatus est sicut ipse aliquot diebus post, Luthero exemplum remittens, scribit die 22. Maii.*

In proof of all that he here alleges, he quotes Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd in the original Latin, which, as we have already seen, says not one word about *sending* the "Apology" to Luther,

Now let the reader compare our Latin quotation from Coelestin with our Latin quotation from Chytraeus. What does he find? Why, with the exception of a few words at the beginning, he finds, in both, the same identical words, the same forms of the same words, the same moods and tenses of verbs, the same abbreviations of words, the same collocation of words, and with the exception of a comma or two, the same punctuation. Is all

*Luther's Antheil, 58 et seq.; Niedner's Zeitschrift (1865), 572.

this accidental? Will the doctrine of Chance produce such results with two men who write in entire independence of each other? Does Mr. Haas believe that it will? In the presence of such an exhibition how dare he look his readers in the face and say that "we (the present writer) rest an argument on a single word"? We did not, and we do not, make an *argument*. We offered and offer an ocular demonstration, namely, that one of those authors took his statement well-nigh bodily from the other.

Mr. Haas tried to break the force of our demonstration by saying that we "would legitimately be compelled to prove the dependence of the Latin Chytraeus on Coelestin in many points." To *demonstrate* this dependence in *one* point is sufficient for our purpose, and here the matter might rest; but Coelestin openly charged that Chytraeus appropriated his (Coelestin's) work.* If Mr. Haas does not know that, he is not prepared to write so confidently on this subject. If he knows it, and does not inform his readers of it, there is another and graver reason why he should not write on this subject.

Coelestin could not have appropriated the Latin paragraph from the Latin Chytraeus, for the reason that the Preface to the Latin Chytraeus bears date *Pridie Natalis Mariae*, that is September 7th, 1578, and its title page is dated 1578, whereas the "Epistle Dedicatory" of the Coelestin is dated, December 17th, 1576, and its title page is dated 1577. That is:

The Latin Chytraeus,	Year	1578	Mo.	9	Day	7.
The Coelestin,	"	1576	"	12	"	17.
Difference,	"		"	1	"	8 " 20.

Again: This is not argument; it is a demonstration of the priority of the publication of the Coelestin by more than a year and a half. What has Mr. Haas to demonstrate *per contra*? Utterly puerile and evasive is his quotation from Matthew Ritter: Davide Chytraeo, Lutheri et Philippi auditore—which he knows perfectly well means simply that Chytraeus was a student under Luther and Philip at Wittenberg—which nobody denies, but which has nothing to do with the subject in hand. The

*Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie.

man who takes refuge behind such a transparency only exposes himself broadside.

It is true that Chytraeus' friends countercharged that Coelestin appropriated Chytraeus' work. But that can apply only to the German Chytraeus, which was published early in 1576.* No doubt each appropriated the work of the other; but it stands demonstrated that Coelestin was the first to put the *exemplum Luthero remittens* into print. Is Mr. Haas convinced?

But grant for the sake of argument that the *exemplum Luthero remittens* is equally original with both Coelestin and Chytraeus. What follows? Why absolutely nothing, except the conclusion that each misread or misinterpreted Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd, for we say once more that that letter does not reveal the shadow of a shade of an intimation of a *sending* of the "Apology" to Luther, May 22nd; nor has Mr. Haas even intimated that it contains any such intimation. Failing utterly in argument and being without a single fact to support his theory of a second sending, Mr. Haas seeks to strengthen his attempted inversion of dates, and his palpable ignoring of facts, by saying that Chytraeus "may have heard this (about a second sending) from Melanchthon." "May have"! This is the way Mr. Haas writes "history presented with its pragmatism." Does it satisfy the reader?

Mr. Haas knows quite as well as he knows right from wrong, that there is not a solitary line of documentary evidence from either Luther or Melanchthon, or from any of their contemporaries, nor a solitary hearsay recorded by any of their contemporaries, nor a solitary tradition from the year 1530, which even hints at the sending of the "Apology" to Luther, May 22nd. Mr. Haas knows all this; at least he is destitute of knowledge to the contrary. "May have" are the magic words by which he prestidigitates "the Genesis of the Augsburg Confession."

3. Mr. Haas supports his master's theory of a *third* sending of the Confession to Luther after June 14th, by quoting as follows Melanchthon's Latin Preface to the *Corpus Doctrinae*, writ-

*C. R. XXVI., 102.

ten, February 16th, 1560.* "I brought together, therefore, in singleness of purpose the principal points of the Confession, embracing pretty nearly the sum of the doctrine of our Churches, both that an answer might be given the Emperor, and that false accusations might be dispelled. I assumed nothing to myself. In the presence of the Princes and other governors and of the preachers it was discussed and determined upon in order, sentence by sentence. The complete form of the Confession was subsequently sent to Luther, who wrote to the Princes that he had read this Confession and approved it. That these things were so done, the Princes, and other honest and learned men yet living, well remember. After this, before the Emperor Charles, in a great assemblage of the Princes, this Confession was read."

(a). Nothing that Melanchthon ever wrote is more truly his than this Preface; but it says not one word about a *third sending*, or about a sending *after* June 14th. This Latin Preface and the corresponding German Preface† both speak of only *one* sending; and those incomparable theologians and historians, Kirchner, Selnecker and Chemnitz, two of them Melanchthon's pupils, say that this one sending, in proof of which they quote this Latin Preface, took place "a full month before the arrival of the Emperor." That they mean the sending of May 11th is shown by the fact that they quote as proof, the letters respectively of the Elector and Melanchthon of that date, and Luther's letter of May 15th to the Elector.‡ These men and their judgment are ignored by Mr. Haas. The reader will have no difficulty in believing that these men were quite as capable of interpreting Melanchthon's Preface as Mr. Haas is, and that they knew enough also to write "the genesis of the Augsburg Confession" correctly.§

*C. R. IX., 105, et seq.

†C. R. IX., 930;

‡Gründliche Historia, pp. 109, 110.

§Selnecker says that he had heard Melanchthon speak about matters concerning the Diet of Augsburg; but he gives no intimation of a *second* or of a *third* sending. Oratio de Confessione Augustana Dec. 14th, 1590. Hildesia. Erhard Schnepf says: "It is known to all who were present at

(b). We have neither time nor space for a lengthy review of Mr. Haas's translation and interpretation of this Latin Preface. A single example of each will show their unreliability. Mr. Haas translates the neuter form, *disputatum est* by: "It was discussed and determined upon." Mr. Haas knows that the words: "determined upon" are an interpolation pure and simple. He knows that there is nothing in the original which justifies this addition to "was discussed."

His translation of *tota forma Confessionis*, by: "The complete form of the Confession," is inaccurate and misleading, especially when it is accompanied by an explanation which would make the *tota forma* equivalent to the *tota Confessio*. Melancthon does not say that the *tota Confessio* was sent to Luther, but the *tota forma*, a full outline, draft, *Entwurf*, of the Confession, was sent to Luther. Not only do the standard Latin dictionaries warrant such a translation of *forma*; Melancthon's discrimination in the Preface between *tota forma Confessionis*, and simply, *Confessio*; the time of the sending indicated in the German Preface (ignored by Mr. Haas); the "*hat gefallen lassen*" of the German preface compared with the *uberlesen* and *gefället mir* in Luther's letter of May 15th to the

that deliberation at Augsburg in the year of our Lord, 1530, in which the Confession, recently written, before its presentation to the Roman Emperor Charles V., was subjected to the criticism of the chief theologians, and of those who were counselors to the Princes, and to the Legates of the two cities; for which reason it was decided at that time to employ only the adverb *vere* (truly), although it was ambiguous, as many at that time maintained; since not one of all those then who united with the Augsburg Confession and were admitted to this congress of deliberators, thought with the Zwinglians. For I myself was present and was a part of what was done," *Confessio de Eucharistia*, 1555, Cyprian, p. 56.) It is passing strange that Dr. Krauth should say: "The 'congress of deliberators' was subsequent to May 22. The single fact that Schnepf was present at it, proves that it refers to nothing previous to May 11, for Schnepf did not come till May 12." *Chron.* p. 52.

1. Dr. Fiege, the Chancellor, and Erhard Schnepf, the Chaplain of Philip of Hesse, came to Augsburg, May 3rd. (C. R. II., 39, Jonas's Letters, I., 148; Coelestin, I., 40; Chytraeus, 26; Schirrmacher, 467.) It is documentarily certain then that before May 11th at least the following could have formed a "congress of deliberators": The Elector, John, Duke

Elector, and with the *legisse et probare* of the Latin Preface and Melanchthon's use of the word *forma* found elsewhere;—all these things, in the absence of facts to the contrary, conspire, chronologically, historically, philologically, and lexically, to exclude Mr. Haas's interpretation, and to justify German scholars in saying that *der erste Entwurf, der fertige Entwurf*, that, and nothing more, was sent to Luther.

Mr. Haas's translation and interpretation of the Latin Preface, can be likened only to the bed of Procrustes. They are now too long and now too short. But unfortunately for him he had his Theseus already, as by anticipation, in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., 1878, p. 621 et seqq., to which the reader is referred.

(c). In the QUARTERLY for July, 1897, p. 323, we showed that no *discussion and determining upon* the Confession, could possibly have taken place, June 15th. Plitt well says: "June

John Frederick, Duke Francis of Lüneberg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt Count Wolf of Henneberg, Hoyer of Mansfeld, the two Saxon chancellors Brück and Beyer, the Chancellor of Hesse, Dr. Fiege, the theologians, Spalatin, Agricola, Jonas, Schnepf, and Melanchthon, for all these were at Augsburg by May 3rd.

May 15, the Nuremberg legates came to Augsburg, (C. R. II., 50) and May 21st the legate from Reutlingen came (Schirmacher 472). Hence on or before May 22nd every one of the parties and persons indicated in Schnepf's report could have been present in "the congress of deliberators."

2. It is documentarily certain that the adverb *vere* was not first used *late*, in the composition of the Confession, for we find it in the oldest MS. copies, which, Dr. Krauth himself being witness, date almost, if not quite to the earliest form of the Confession. Hence Schnepf's testimony has no specific reference to anything which took place after June 14th. But

3. It is made perfectly clear by the original that by the words, "that deliberation," Schnepf has reference to no particular day and transaction, but to the period of deliberation extending through more than seven weeks, during which we know from other official documents, the Confession was almost continuously subjected to the judgment of theologians, counselors and legates. Hence Schnepf's testimony in no sense favors a *third* sending, and so to employ it is pitifully to beg the question; and of Dr. Krauth's eight references, not one quotes or refers to it in support of a *third* sending.

15th nothing was yet determined upon."* We showed further, pp. 323-4, that the three following days were entirely taken up with other matters, and that in the many original records of these three days the Confession is not once mentioned. Mr. Hass has offered no refutation of what we there demonstrated out of original and official documents.

(d). The letter of June 19th shows to a demonstration that up to that time the Confession was not yet finished.† Hence Bindseil justly says: "Even June 19th the Confession is not finished, because its authors were in doubt whether they should finish it so, or reduce it to an epitome".‡ The letter further shows to a demonstration, that concert of action had not extended beyond the Elector of Brandenburg, the Nuremberg legates, and the Elector of Saxony, and that even the last named had given only a *quasi* consent to have his Confession become the common Confession of the Protestants. Hence as the Confession was not yet finished, and as it had not yet become a common document, the conditions for this imagined third sending are not yet supplied. Bindseil goes on to say: "Also in the following days these authors consulted about individual parts of the Confession; even June 23rd, when all, who were of the evangelical faith, had assembled for hearing and sanctioning the Confession, they were engaged in transcribing it, and in preparing the Proem and Epilogue."§ Bindseil bases these statements on official documents which lie before us. The contents of this letter of June 19th are ignored by Mr. Haas.

(e). The Postscript to the letter of the Nuremberg legates, June 21st, written after 5 o'clock, P. M., likewise shows to a demonstration that it was not until that hour, that it was decided to make the Saxon Confession the common Confession; that at that hour some of the princes, and the counselors of the others, "were holding a session over such articles, further to revise, to arrange and to finish them."|| The testimony of this Postscript is also absolutely ignored by Mr. Haas. Is this telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about

*Einleitung, I., 533, n. †C. R. II., 112. ‡C. R. XXVI., 209.

§C. R. XXVI., 209. ||C. R. II., 124; LUTH. QUART., July, 1897, p. 326.

the genesis of the Augsburg Confession? Mr. Haas knows that this Postscript puts the eternal quietus on his theory, for according to his theory this supposed *third* sending did not take place until after the Confession had been adopted as the common Confession of the Protestants, and had been completed and "determined upon." It is documentarily certain that such adoption, completion, and "determining upon," did not take place until after 5 o'clock, P. M., on Tuesday, June 21st. In four days after that time the Confession was in the hands of Charles V. It took, at the very lowest estimate, six days for a courier to carry a message from Augsburg to Coburg and to return with an answer. Again: This is not argument; it is demonstration. We wonder that in his desperation, Mr. Haas does not exclaim: They "may have" telephoned it to Luther, and he "may have" telephoned it back!

(f). Further: It is documentarily certain that the Confession was not *finally* completed and "determined upon" until Thursday,* June 23rd, when the Nurenbergers, the delegate from Reut-

*C. R. II., 127. Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865) 577; Plitt's *Einleitung*, I., 533; Nösgen's *Symbolik*, (1897), p. 76. Plitt says: "If the Confession was to be used in common, then must all those passages be changed, which make special reference to the Saxon. A decision seems to have been reached through the opening of the Diet, when the combined power of their Romish enemies threatened, and the Emperor demanded of each one a Latin and German statement of his grievances and views. In this way the concentration of evangelicals under the one Confession became imperative; for how could the other evangelical estates prepare such a document in so short a time? The next morning saw the counselors of the different princes assembled at the quarters of the Elector in order 'further to revise, to prepare and to finish' the articles. They wished to lay a common hand on the Confession, and they thought they had time for thorough revision and careful deliberation, for on that morning of June 21st the Nurenberg legates were instructed to send for their preachers, and especially for Osiander, to assist. But now things advanced rapidly. * * They must quickly make a clean copy of the Confession, and finally determine upon the Preface and the Conclusion. This last took place on Thursday morning." Plitt has made a slight mistake by writing "morning of June 21st" instead of "evening of June 21st." See the post-script to the letter of the Nurenbergers, C. R. II., 124; LUTH. QUART., July, 1897, p. 326.

lingen, the Princes, their counselors and theologians, held a session from 9 o'clock A. M. to 3 o'clock P. M., for the purpose of "reading aloud, examining, and discussing the specified Confession of faith."* Hence Engelhardt, Plitt and Nösger are entirely correct when they say that the final act of union and completion took place, Thursday, June 23rd, and assign as the immediate cause of the union of the evangelicals, the order issued by the Emperor at the opening of the Diet, that the Protestants should present their views and grievances on June 24th.† These facts, so thoroughly attested by official documents, have been ignored by Mr. Haas.

(g) From June 15th (up to which time "nothing was yet determined upon,"—Plitt) to the evening of June 21st, as we showed in this QUARTERLY‡ a year ago, every available hour was so *completely* occupied with other most important transactions, as to leave no time for such "determining upon in order, sentence by sentence," as is expressly demanded for Mr. Haas's theory. What does Mr. Haas oppose to our facts, gathered from official and other contemporaneous documents? Absolutely *nothing*, except his own interpretation of Melanchthon's Preface. At this point again he is without facts and without argument. He says we "impugn Melanchthon's veracity." We do no such thing. It is Mr. Haas who impugns Melanchthon's veracity, for he tries to make him testify to a *third* sending of the Confession to Luther, whereas, he knows that neither Luther nor Melanchthon, nor any of their contemporaries ever speak of, or intimate, or indicate, or write about a *third* sending. Mr. Haas also knows that he has utterly ignored Melanchthon's German Preface, which makes plain the one or two microscopic uncertainties on which he seeks a footing for his theory. Of the Latin Preface he says: "As to the acceptance of this by many authorities, read Krauth, Chron. p. 56 ff." Here Mr. Haas shows, as in a climax, the second-hand character of the work which he has been doing. If he had examined these "many authorities," nearly all of which lie before us at this moment, he would have discovered that *not one of them*, NOT ONE

*C. R. II., 127.

†*Einleitung*, I. 533, n.

‡Pp. 328-9

OF THEM, asserts a *third* sending, or quotes this Preface in support of a *third* sending. Mr. Haas's subserviency to *one* authority, and his neglect of "many authorities," or his unwillingness to lay bare the use made of that Preface by the "many authorities," to which he refers his readers, is a most inexplicable procedure. He knows that not one of his readers out of a hundred has access to those "many authorities." Why does he not tell his readers, *in verbis ipsissimis*, how those "many authorities" employ this Preface? Why does he intimate the very *reverse* of the facts in the case? We will charitably conclude that he has not read what he commands others to read.

(h). If Mr. Haas be even moderately acquainted with the literature of symbolics, he knows that such writers as Planck, Hase, Danz, Pfaff, Fikenscher, Rotermund, Guericke, Vilmar, Bindseil, Philippi, Engelhardt, Knaake, Köstlin, Plitt, Landerer, Herrlinger, Müller, Zockler, Schmidt (Carl), Schmidt (Hermann), Loofs, Nösgen *et al.* mention *only* the sending of May 11th; that Many of these most competent writers name the thing sent *adumbratio, prima adumbratio, der Entwurf, der erste Entwurf, der fertige Entwurf*, that is, the *draft, the first draft, the finished draft*; that some of these writer say expressly and explicitly, that this was the only form in which Luther saw the Confession until after it had been delivered to the Emperor; and that none of the writers named above contradict or seek to confute those who say that only *der erste Entwurf, der fertige Entwurf*, was sent to Luther. The tremendous array of learning represented by the names given above, is absolutely ignored by Mr. Haas. Will he insinuate that those men were under the influence of Rückert and Heppe? or that their judgment "is colored by subjective preconceptions, personal like and dislike"? It is presumed that Mr. Haas knows that the German writer on the genesis of the Augsburg Confession, who should quote Coelestin or Chytraeus in support of a theory of a *second* sending, or Melanchthon's Latin Preface in support of a theory of a *third* sending, would be regarded as being about as "smart" as the American chemist would be regarded, who should quote Mrs. Phelps in support of a theory of caloric.

In conclusion it may be said that this dispute is a good example of "a tempest in a teapot," or of "much ado about nothing." But the boldness with which the theory of a *second* sending, has been revived, and the confidence with which a theory of a third sending has been invented, and the ingenuity and violence displayed in defending both theories, confessed to be theories only—lift the matter into a high relative importance. A certain meaning is to be read into the Confession. But before this can be consistently done, certain theories must be read into its history; otherwise the meaning will be contradicted by the history, as though the Confession did not stand or fall by the application of the one only infallible test.

We believe that in our two articles we have shown the utter invalidity of every argument used to support these theories.

1. They do not rest on one line of documentary evidence which speaks of, or hints at a *second*, or *third* sending, and not one line of such documentary evidence has been produced to support them. The sending noted in Melanchthon's Preface, German and Latin, was referred by the older German writers explicitly to the sending of May 11th.

2. The theories do not rest even on tradition, or on hearsay; and no tradition, nor hearsay has been quoted in their support by Mr. Haas.

3. The Coelestin—Chytraeus statement about a second sending has been completely abandoned by modern writers, who, since the publication of the Nuremburg correspondence and other contemporaneous documents, have discovered, that such statement is absolutely incapable of verification.

4. The theory of a *third* sending is based wholly on an *interpretation* of Melanchthon's Latin Preface. The German Preface which compels a different conclusion is persistently ignored. That is, it is not quoted in its *full* text on the point at issue. So likewise the Nuremburg letters as given in the *QUARTERLY* for July, 1897, pp. 325-6.

5. It is impossible to believe that the Nurenbergers, who report all transactions in regard to the Confession so minutely; who wrote five long letters to their senate from June 15th to

June 21st; who profess to give, and promise that they will give, every item of news in regard to the Confession and the transactions of the Evangelicals—it is impossible to believe, that this correspondence should be silent in regard to so important a matter as the sending of the Confession to Luther and his return of it, had such sending and return occurred—to which must be added letters of Melanchthon, Brentz, and Jonas, which report nothing of the kind.

Finally: We have read nearly all the Latin and German histories of the Confession which have ever been published. Not a solitary one read by us propounds or defends a theory of a *third* sending, and Mr. Haas has not quoted a solitary Latin or German history which propounds or defends such a theory. His position is unique. It is *Haasius contra mundum*. It might be sublime, if it were not ridiculous; and his "Genesis of the Augsburg Confession" might have had some scientific value, had its author not ignored so many facts and fathered so many theories.

ARTICLE VI.

REV. WILLIAM H. LUCKENBACH, D. D.

BY REV. WILLIAM HULL, D. D.

The family from which the subject of this biographical sketch descended were Germans who immigrated to this country in 1741, and settled at Bethlehem, in Pennsylvania. They belonged to the Moravians or United Brethren, members of which society founded Bethlehem and established churches and institutions of learning and charity there, which still distinguish that locality and make it a centre for that religious demonstration. Nazareth Hall, a classical school, and the Moravian Seminary for young ladies, have had a national reputation.

A "Historical Sketch of Bethlehem, in Pennsylvania, with some account of the Moravian Church," published by John Hill Martin, of the Philadelphia Bar, in 1873, shows that from the time of the settlement of the town in 1741, to the time of the publication of the book, persons by the name of Luckenbach have occupied prominent positions in the affairs of Bethlehem. One was Rev. Abraham Luckenbach, who had charge of the Missionary establishments of the Moravian Brethren among the American Indians. He published a book in 1838, entitled, "Forty-six Select Scripture Narrations from the Old Testament, embellished with engravings: for the use of Indian Youth. Translated into the Delaware Indian by A. Luckenbach."

The records show that persons of that name are mentioned among mayors, councilmen, collectors of internal revenue, members of missionary societies, officers and privates during the rebellion, leading business men, etc. The family must have had a great taste for music, as the names of no less than seven were recorded at one time as members of the Bethlehem Band.

In 1867, *The Moravian* published the following obituary notice:

"Died at Bethlehem, Pa., Dec. 1, 1897, very suddenly, Mrs.

Elizabeth Luckenbach, relict of the late David Luckenbach, in the 85th year of her age.

"The deceased was one of the oldest members of the church at Bethlehem. For 35 years she lived with her husband on one of the river farms belonging to the church, in the old homestead, the site of which is now occupied by the Railroad offices of the Lehigh Valley Railroad in the present borough of South Bethlehem.

"She was the mother of ten children, all of whom are living, and had sixty-six grand-children, and forty-three great grand-children, of whom thirty died before her. Direct descendants to the number of eighty-nine survive her."

Rev. Louis David de Schweinitz, a prominent minister among Moravians, made a visit to Bethlehem, and he came in contact, the same day, with nine persons by the name of Luckenbach, and then he says: "And I ceased to wonder at the number of Luckenbachs and their various occupations, when I was informed at this wedding (when William Luckenbach, Jr., was married), that all the relatives of the parties had been invited, and there was present on the part of the bride-groom, 1 grandfather and 1 grand-mother: 3 great-uncles and 3 great-aunts; 1 father and 1 mother; 17 uncles and 18 aunts; 10 brothers and sisters, and 21 first cousins, making 80 near relatives, members of the society, and all descended from old Mr. Luckenbach, who had been dead for upwards of 80 years. *God save the Luckenbachs.*"

The name of the father of the subject of this sketch was George B. Luckenbach and his mother Julia A. Bisel. The parents or their ancestors, had moved from Bethlehem, and they lived successively at Doylestown, Easton and Philadelphia. The father was a cabinet-maker by occupation and a member of the Lutheran Church.

On Sunday, April 13, 1828, William Henry Luckenbach, their oldest son was born at Doylestown. His maternal grandmother on her first visit to her daughter after the birth of this goodly child took him in her arms and placing her hand upon

his head prayed God that he might become a minister of the Gospel—a prayer which was subsequently fulfilled.

After the removal of the family to Philadelphia, where the father carried on the business of cabinet-making, and in which William Henry aided him, on reaching a proper age, the mind of the son leaned in the direction of the ministry, but this met with the father's opposition, who regarded the vocation as a starving profession. Finding that he could not gain his father's consent, he deferred to his parent's view of the question until he reached the age of twenty one. In the meantime he read such books as would best further the end he had in view.

On reaching his majority, he entered Dickinson College as a student in the autumn of 1848. There he was a classmate of John F. Hurst, now a Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. A few years ago the latter preached in the auditorium at Ocean Grove, and Dr. Luckenbach after the service held an interview with him. They had not met each other since their college days at Dickinson, and they mutually enjoyed a renewal of the friendship of former days.

He took the classical course at college and then he commenced a course in theology under the direction of Rev. Dr. E. W. Hutter, of Philadelphia. On completing these studies he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the East Pennsylvania Synod on the 25th of September, 1855. Rev. George Parson was then the President of that body. In the autumn of the same year he was offered and accepted a call to become pastor of the Lutheran Church at Lockport, N. Y. He was now twenty-seven years of age—a tall, well-formed, intellectual looking young man of commanding presence with a clear voice, good delivery, pleasant manner with a material in his sermons which showed an intellectual calibre far above the average. He was commencing his great life work under the most favorable auspices. He was cordially received at Lockport, and large audiences attended upon his ministrations. He already gave promise of his future usefulness and eminence.

On the 15th of September, 1857, he was ordained to the Gospel ministry at Athens, by the Hartwick Synod, in whose bonds his

congregation was located and which he had joined by letter from the East Pennsylvania Synod. Rev. Adam Crounse was then the President of that body.

On Monday afternoon, September 14, 1857, he preached before the Synod in Zion's Lutheran Church, Athens, from Eccl. 9 : 11, "I returned and saw under the sun that the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong; neither yet bread to the wise, nor riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth unto them all."

His ability as a preacher must have been very marked at the very beginning of his ministry, as a member of that congregation, still living, and now over eighty years old, who heard that sermon, has a number of times asked us concerning the speaker, and he told how deeply he was impressed by the discourse, remarking, "I said to my family, that young man will make his mark in the world." How remarkably that prophecy has been fulfilled.

At the close of 1857 he accepted a call to a Lutheran Church at Pottsville in his native state. On the 13th of April, 1857, he married Miss Mary J. Compton, of Lockport, N. Y., daughter of Randolph and Mary Compton. The family was related to that of the distinguished Alexander Hamilton of revolutionary fame.

In the autumn of 1857 he accepted a call to St. Luke's Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, and from thence he moved to Rhinebeck in 1861. While laboring in this place, during the war, he was offered the chaplaincy of a regiment, which he declined. From 1866 to 1868 he was pastor in Canajoharie—in Red Hook from 1867 to 1872—in Hagerstown, Maryland, Trinity church, from 1872 to 1875—in Taneytown, Maryland, from 1875 to 1878 and Germantown, N. Y., from 1878 to 1894, which closed his career as a successful pastor.

In these several congregations covering a period of thirty-nine years he made full proof of his ministry, in which many were brought into the Church, and in all he was very highly esteemed, and on removing he left behind in them all many friends who were in the warmest sympathy with him and who

held his great qualities of head and heart in the highest admiration.

As a preacher he occupied a very high position. In any company he would have attracted attention. His intellectual endowments and goodness of heart were expressed in his countenance. He was an honor to the gospel ministry and it was fortunate for the Church that he persisted in his determination to be a minister. He was a close and diligent student. He never went into the pulpit without the most careful preparation. His discourses always commanded attention and made a deep impression. All his methods in preaching were legitimate and scriptural. His sermons were so well planned and expressed that they were fit to print, and it would add to the literature of the Church if at least a volume were to be selected for publication. His theological studies embraced a wide range and he was well versed in all the ordinary channels of human learning. The articles which he published in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY will stand as proofs of his intellectual and theological ability.

He wrote a book on "*The Folly of Profanity*," that was published by the Lutheran Publication Society and which has received the highest commendation. It is said to be the only work of the kind in the world's literature. It is a volume of about 300 pages.

In 1890 he compiled a volume entitled, "*Song Stories for Little People*," which was published by Funk and Wagnalls. It contains 218 stories in poetry for children, and is a book of 300 pages. No one not having a wide knowledge of the field of English literature could have made such a compilation. His scholarly reading and attainments in the world's literature were very broad.

He furnished two articles for the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. One in Vol. 2 : 242, entitled "*The Christian Ministry of Labor*," which was the substance of an Ordination Discourse preached before the New York Synod in 1871 and published at the request of synod, and one in Vol. 15 : 371, on "*The Comparatively Small Success of Christ's Personal Ministry*."

A number of his sermons and addresses were published near

the time of their delivery in pamphlet and in local and other papers, among which we notice, a Thanksgiving sermon on, "The Grateful Leper," at Canajoharie, N. Y., in 1868. A Valedictory Sermon preached in Hagerstown in Trinity church in 1874; An Address delivered at the Seventh Convention of the Rhinebeck District Association of the Luther League, Red Hook, Nov. 23, 1893; "The Teacher's Reward"; An Address delivered before the Niagara County Teachers' Association; and "A sermon delivered before the Washington Artillery at Pottsville, Penna., on Sunday July 4th, 1858, entitled, "Our National Inheritance."

He left a large scrap-book pasted full of articles which he had contributed to the church papers, and to local papers where he had resided, and these treated of important subjects and showed great intellectual grasp and ability. All his mental productions were of a high order.

In the realm of poetry he was a voluminous writer. Several years ago in looking through the files of the *Lutheran Observer* at Hartwick Seminary, we were surprised to find how large a number of poems he had written. In number he has only been excelled by Rev. Dr. Sheeleigh. Among others, they embrace those written for dedication of churches, centennial celebrations, Lutheran reunions and other festive occasions, including the World's Fair in Chicago. For a prize poem on a piano, he received the gift of a valuable piano. A poem he wrote on "*What art thou doing for Jesus?*" was set to music and published in the *Lutheran Sunday School Herald*. Other poems were set to music and published in musical books of a general character. His poems if collected would fill a good sized volume and they are sufficiently meritorious to be put in permanent form.

All his ministerial life he was an industrious student. In his farewell discourse to the congregation of Trinity church, Hagerstown he said:

"Within the past three years and eight months I have preached and lectured more than three hundred times. Nor was it old material—such as had been prepared for other congre-

tions, prior to my coming here, that was brought to this pulpit from Sunday to Sunday. By far the greater part of the sermons that have been preached to you, were wrought in toilsome, patient study for your benefit. And here let me take occasion to thank you for the general favor with which you have listened to me from time to time. I have yet to hear the first unfavorable, unfriendly comment from any one on my mode of preaching the Word."

From 1886 to 1896 and until the time of his death, he was President of the New York and New Jersey Synod, and he was frequently a delegate to the General Synod during his ministerial life. As President, he filled the office and performed its duties in an admirable manner and to the great satisfaction of his brethren.

Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, conferred upon him the title A. M., and Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, that of D. D. The Lockport congregation made him a Life Director of the American Tract Society and the Red Hook congregation, a Life Director of the American Bible Society.

Several years before his death, while at Germantown, he had a slight attack of paralysis in his study one Sunday after the morning service. From this he soon recovered, but he felt and showed its effects. He resigned at Germantown in 1894 and removed to the city of Hudson, where he acted as a supply, performed the duties of the presidency of synod and labored in literary pursuits. He furnished some articles for the New York daily press for which he was liberally compensated.

In due time a second attack of paralysis overtook him and finally a third which ended his noble and useful life. He peacefully breathed his last, Feb. 23rd, 1896, aged 67 years, 10 months and 10 days, leaving a widow, one son, one daughter with her two children and also two grandchildren, besides the children of a deceased daughter. He was ardently attached to his family and was a model husband and father.

His funeral was held at St. John's Lutheran Church Hudson, Feb. 27th. He was born on Sunday and he died on Sunday. He had two married sisters who lived at too great a distance to

be present. One brother was in Denver, Colorado, and could not be at the funeral, but five other brothers were there and they, with Mr. Compton of Lockport, a brother of Mrs. Luckenbach, were the pall bearers. The deceased was the oldest son of the family, and it was an impressive sight to see the remains carried into the church by his younger brothers. A daily paper of the city in speaking of the funeral said:

"Rev. Prof. J. L. Kistler of Hartwick Seminary, the secretary of the New York and New Jersey Synod, of which the deceased was president, made the prayer at the residence; Rev. William E. Traver, of Viewmonte, made the opening prayer; Rev. Dr. J. J. Young, of New York City, read the Scriptures; Rev. T. C. McDaniel, the pastor of the church, gave out the first hymn; Rev. John W. Lake, of Chatham, made the general prayer; Rev. William Hull, of Albany, preached the sermon; Rev. Mr. Grommisch, of Buffalo, the German secretary of the New York and New Jersey Synod, made the closing prayer, and Rev. C. H. Traver, of Rhinebeck, gave out an original hymn, written by the deceased, to the tune of the hymn, "Abide With Us," which was beautifully sung by the choir.

"Besides the above Lutheran clergymen who took part in the exercises, we noticed Rev. Dr. M. W. Empie, of Churchtown, Rev. A. E. Dietz, of Rhinebeck, Rev. U. F. Graves, of Valatie, Rev. John H. Weaver, of Center Brunswick, Rev. Albert H. Weaver, of Argusville, and Rev. Walter Miller, of Manorton. Several of the clergymen of the city were also present and a large number of Lutheran laymen from many congregations.

"Rev. Dr. G. M. Heindel, of Albany, read the processional as the remains were carried into the church. Beautiful flowers covered the casket, and among them a number of large and magnificent calla lilies."

The sermon was preached from, second Samuel, 3:38: "And the King said unto his servants, know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel."

The speaker referred to the intellectual and the moral greatness of the departed. In reference to the first, among other things he said:

"He was favored by nature with an imposing personal presence. He had a manly and regal bearing. His intellectual endowments were expressed in his countenance. He had a broad, strong, active, robust, comprehensive, well-balanced mind, which was capable of grasping any of the subjects which confront us in this world. In his investigations he was patient, persevering, thorough and exhaustive. He was a diligent student all his life. His sermons were models of clearness, strength, profundity and beauty. His style was remarkable. He was a master of the English language and he was well versed in English literature and in all the ordinary channels of human learning. His writings have greatly enriched the literature of the Church, and they have extended from the Sunday school paper to the Review."

On his moral greatness, among other things the speaker said:

"Some men attract the attention of the world by their intellectual preëminence and at the same time impress the world that they lack in moral and spiritual character. But our departed leader possessed these characteristics in an equal degree with his intellectual endowments. He was as good as he was great. He had a robust Christian character. He had consecrated his life and labors in a profession where he had dwelt in a spiritual atmosphere and where he fed on the grand spiritual truths which he presented to others for their moral and spiritual growth and development.

"His great ability as a preacher at different periods of his ministerial life brought him several offers from churches of other denominations to serve them at a much higher compensation than he ever received in our communion, but he refused these and continued to work until his sun of life set, in the great denomination which had inducted him into the sacred office of the ministry.

"How loyal he was in all his friendships; how manly and fair and honorable and courteous he was in all his intercourse with others from the highest to the lowest. He was, indeed, one of nature's true noblemen.

"How guileless he was in all his ambitions. How he de-

tested insincerity and shame, and craft, and meanness in all its varied forms. How he apprehended and stood for right and justice. He had the courage of his convictions; and irrespective of consequences, he stood for the right and the true as he apprehended them. What a well-rounded and evenly-balanced character he possessed."

That this dear brother was ripening for glory and immortality appears from a hymn which he wrote not long before his death, and which was sung at his funeral. It was entitled, "*Still be with Me*," and was as follows:

"Still be with me, dear Lord, thro' all the day,
For with Thee I will not be led astray;
The tempter's arts successful cannot be,
If he describes that Thou art still with me.

I laid me down and gently fell asleep,
Believing Thou would'st vigil o'er me keep;
Nor was my trust in vain, since now I see,
On this new morn, that Thou art still with me.

Of Thee, my never-failing Friend, I ask,
The needed strength for this day's wonted task;
And if ills come I do not now forsee.
I will not fail if Thou art still with me.

I will not fondly covet treasure here,
Where carnal joys, like dreams, soon disappear:
To me 'tis happiness beyond degree
To know always that Thou art still with me.

Content am I, with this day's setting sun,
To be discharged, if all my work be done:—
From toil and pain and sin to be set free,
And sing in heaven, that Thou art still with me."

His mortal remains were buried in the beautiful cemetery at Germantown, where he had labored during sixteen years of his ministerial life, and where also reposes the body of Rev. Dr. Augustus Wackerhagen, who had served the congregation for thirty-five years. Peace to their ashes. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.

ARTICLE VII.

THE SCRIPTURE VIEW OF IMMORTALITY.

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D. D.

That the soul is immortal is questioned by those only who are given to unbelief and skepticism. For to the religious world the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is one of the cardinal doctrines of the Bible. The concern of the people of all ages has not been so much about their present as their future existence. Even Job raised the question, "if a man die shall he live again?" But the Scriptural grounds for this belief and concern have not been so thoroughly apprehended as the antiquity of the doctrine would indicate. The popular conviction has rested rather upon a presumption than upon any definite Scriptural conceptions of the subject. But strange as it may seem the word "*immortality*" does not occur in the Old Testament Scriptures, and but five times in the New. Its New Testament use is two fold: First in the sense of a deathless, imperishable (*αθανασία*) existence. 1 Cor. 15 : 53, 54; 1 Tim. 6 : 16. And second in the sense of incorruption (*αφθαρσία*). Rom. 2 : 7; 2 Tim. 1 : 10.

And yet notwithstanding the comparative absence of the word in the Scriptures the doctrine of the immortality of the soul has not been conceived in modern thought, nor cradled in so-called "New Theology." But it is a doctrine of antiquity, one which has commanded the consideration of the people of every age and nation of the world. And this general concern has grown out of,

I. *The Nature of the Soul.* The Scriptures declare that God breathed into man the breath of life and he became a living soul.* They do not say that he became a living creature, or a living man, but a "*living soul*." God must therefore have imparted something to man which he did not impart to any other portion of his creation. For we have no record anywhere that

*Gen. 2 : 7.

God imparted anything of his own to any part of the Creation, excepting man, but simply commanded and it was done. But we do read of man that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul*—endowed with a different nature, and other qualifications than those of any other part of creation. Hence the component parts of man—soul and body. The soul must therefore be divine in its nature. For we observe,

1. *That nothing of a material character can be attributed to God.* But God said (Gen. 1 : 26): "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." But it is also written: "*God is a Spirit.*" John 4 : 24. Therefore that which God breathed into man must have been spiritual life. And so it is written, "*and man became a living soul!*" And therefore Luther's definition of the soul, "The soul of man is a created spirit able to know, to feel, and to will."† God, who is a Spirit, created man in his own image or likeness, capable of knowing, feeling and willing. But that which has come thus from the hand of God must be imperishable—immortal. Therefore it is written of the mortality of the body, but of the immortality of the soul: (Eccl. 13 : 7) "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it." Out of the very nature of the soul therefore comes welling up the idea of immortality.

2. It is said that "they that worship God must worship him in Spirit." Common observation has taught us that it is unnatural for any other creature than man to worship. We do not find the disposition to worship in any part of the animal creation. They cannot even be taught to worship. On the other hand we observe that it is just as natural for the human race—the only creatures with spiritual natures—to worship. Man has universally been disposed to reverence and fear God. In every age and condition of the world he has always manifested a disposition to worship. He has never become so debased in sin that this disposition has not asserted itself. It cannot be buried so deep beneath the rubbish of this sinful world but that it comes welling up spontaneously amidst it all. Here an illustra-

*Gen. 2 : 7.

†Luther's Smaller Catechism (Gen. Synod Edition) page 49, q. 147.

tion from Beecher is to the point: "These troublesome vines," exclaims the vintner, "why can they not grow upright like bushes?" And one man comes to him and says, "it is all because you have tied them to oak stakes. If you will get cedar stakes you will have no difficulty." The cedar stakes are provided, but still the vines creep and cling. Another man says, "Cedar stakes are not good; you must have hickory." He gets hickory, but the vines clasp also. Another man says, "It is not hickory but chestnut stakes you need;" and so he gets the chestnut stakes, but the vines continue to creep and cling. At length there comes a man who says, "Your course is wrong from beginning to end. If you will throw away all your stakes, and stop your training, and leave the vines to nature you will have none of these clambering, wild-roaming, embracing ways." So the vintner pulls up the stakes, and clears the piles of timber from the ground, and leaves the vines unsupported. And now do they cease to grow upright, and to throw out tendrils and clasping rings? No. It is their nature to cling to something; and if you will not give them hold to climb upward, they will not on that account cease to reach out, but will spread all over the ground, clasping cold stones, and embracing every worthless stick, and the very grass.

Now our religious nature, like the vine, must have something to cling to; and one man says, "The Brahminical system is as good as the Christian;" another says, "The old Greek mythology is better than either;" another says, "Catholicism is preferable to the Protestant form of Christianity;" and then comes a man who declares that all systems are extraneous and hurtful, and that if we were left to grow up unprejudiced, with the light and laws of nature, such a thing as a religious system would never be known or needed. "First," he says, "the nurse befools the child, and then the mother takes him, and then the priest and the Church; and so he is educated in false views from the beginning." The truth of the matter is this: Religious systems do not create the religious nature in man. The religious nature itself, craving and longing for development, creates both the systems and the priests who minister in them. The heart,

with its thousand tendrils, reaches forth to God, and in its reaching clasps whatever it may. In short this disposition to cleave to and worship God can be accounted for only on the ground of man's spiritual-immortal-nature.

3. We observe that only spiritual or divine natures can render spiritual or divine service. If the human soul were not divine in its nature—if man were not in possession of immortality—the scripture injunction (John 4 : 24), "they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit," would be an utter impossibility. But God never has exacted impossibilities of man. Therefore man must have the ability to worship a spiritual being to render spiritual service. And hence the spiritual-immortal-nature of the soul. But we note,

II. Intuition is another evidence of the immortality of the soul. One of the strange things of the human race for which infidelity does not pretend to account is the fact that man's hopes and aspirations can not be limited to his present existence. He invariably and almost unconsciously looks through the veil into a future existence. This is true of all ages, past and present, and of all classes of people; of the learned and the illiterate; of the Jews and the Gentiles—the heathen philosophers not excepted. Confucius plainly taught the immortality of the soul. Plato, speaking of the immortality of the soul, very confidently asked, "Can the soul which is invisible, and which goes to another place, like itself excellent, pure and invisible, into the presence of a good and wise God—can this soul of ours, when separated from the body, be immediately dispersed and destroyed?" And with equal confidence answers, "*Nay, every soul is immortal.*" And so Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, Pliny, Seneca, Plutarch—all with one accord in their heathen way believed in and taught the immortality of the soul. The pen of the English poet Addison, of more than a century and a half ago, moved as by inspiration, wrote :

"Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself and startles at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis heaven itself that points out an hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man."

And then, as with uplifted eye, peering into the future, flow forth the lines :

"The stars shall fade away, the sun himself
Grow dim with age, and nature sink in years ;
But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,
Unhurt amidst the war of elements,
The wreck of matter and the crush of worlds !"

And Sir Walter Raleigh, the night before his death, wrote the following lines on a blank leaf of his Bible :

"E'en such is time ; who takes in trust
Our youth, our joys, and all we have,
And pays us but with age and dust ;
Who in the dark and silent grave,
When we have wander'd all our ways,
Shuts up the story of our days.
But from this earth, this grave, this dust,
The Lord will raise me up, I trust !"

And the great Bulwer has presented this thought in his own elegant language thus : "I can not believe that the earth is man's abiding place. It can't be that our life is cast up by the ocean of eternity to float a moment on its waves, and then sink into nothingness ; else, why is it that the glorious aspirations which leap like angels from the temple of our heart are forever wandering about unsatisfied ? Why is it that the rainbow and clouds come over with a beauty that is not of earth, and then pass off, and leave to us to muse upon their favored loveliness ? Why is it that the stars, who hold their festival around the mid-night throne, are set above the grasp of our limited faculties, forever mocking us with their unapproachable glory ? And, finally, why is it that bright forms of human beauty are presented to our view, and then taken from us, leaving the thousand streams of our affection to flow back in Alpine torrents upon our heart ? We are born for a higher destiny than that of earth ; there is a realm where the rainbow never fades, where the stars will be spread before us like islands that slumber on the ocean ; and where the beams that pass before us like shadows will stay in our presence forever."

But looking at it from a slightly different point of view does some one suggest that the application on the part of man of

the term mortal to himself, would seem to afford an exception to our general proposition, and to contradict the doctrine of the soul's instinctive belief in its own immortality? Not so. August Nicholas in his "Etudes Philosophique sur le Christianisme," after having described the natural phenomena of dissolution as they appear in man, in the beast, and in the plant, pertinently asks: "How comes it that, in the heart of that universal destruction amid which we live, in the sepulcher of our mortal life wherein we are immured, the idea of our own immortality has penetrated—rather has germinated and flourished? Why is it that no one thinks of attaching this idea to the organic or vital principle of a plant, or of a beast, and that every one, almost without hesitation, does attach it to the vital principle, or to that other mortal, we call man? And, then, why is it that on the other hand, to himself alone man applies the adjective mortal? We never talk about the mortality of brutes. Strange that in a world where all is mortal man should reserve this qualification for himself. May not, however, precisely the reverse be true, and because he alone of all God's creatures needs to be reminded that, at least in one respect—as to his body—he, as well as all things else, is mortal, his Maker has put it into his mind instinctively to characterize himself accordingly?"

Immortality is not an outgrowth of modern training or speculation therefore. As a doctrine it was cradled with the human race in Paradise and has been propagated with each successive generation as the spontaneous outflow of intuition:

"O, listen man!

A voice within us speaks that startling word,
Man thou shalt never die! Celestial voices
By angel fingers touched, when the mild stars
Of morning sang together, sound forth still
The song of our immortality."—DANA.

Verily from well-nigh every human heart comes welling up the intuitive conviction: "*The soul is immortal.*" But let us consider,

III. The Scripture testimony in reference to the immortality of the soul.

At the very beginning of the Scriptures we are told (Gen. 2 : 7) that God breathed into man the breath of life and he became a living soul. Again it is written (2 Tim. 1 : 10): "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and *hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.*" According to Webster immortality means, "that which can not die, which is imperishable, having an unlimited existence." From the passage in Genesis we are evidently taught that God breathed of his own divine essence into man. Therefore the soul must be divine, and that which is divine can not be other than imperishable, immortal. Hence we read (Eccl. 12 : 7): "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." And so as Stephen was stoned he cried (Acts 7 : 59): "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." His body perished, but his immortal soul returned to God.

We are also taught the immortality of the soul in the Scriptures from the continuation of life after man's death. Our Lord said (John 11 : 25, 26): "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet *shall he live.* And whosoever liveth and believeth in me *shall never die.*" Again (3 : 36): "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Paul quoting Habakkuk (2 : 4) says: "The just shall live by faith." (Rom. 1 : 18) Indeed the Bible is full of this kind of promises. In Romans 6 : 23 it is written: "The gift of God is eternal life." According to John 3 : 16 it is written: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whoever believeth in him should *not perish*, but have *everlasting life.*" In 1 Cor. 15 : 53, 54, we read: "For this *corruptible* must put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal* must put on *immortality.* So when this corruption shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory." In this passage we have clearly stated the change that shall take place after death. It is described as a change from *corruption* to *incorruption*—from *mortality* to *immortality*.

The Scriptures also teach the immortality of the soul in their

descriptions of death. Of the patriarchs we read: "Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age." Gen. 24 : 8. It was not life, but the ghost—the divine, the immortal—which he gave up. "And Isaac gave up the ghost, and died and was gathered unto his people." Gen. 35 : 29. "And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people." Gen. 49 : 33. And of our Lord it is written (Matt. 27 : 50): "When he had cried with a loud voice he yielded up the ghost." Now it will be observed,

1. That in each of these passages we have the same word—"Ghost"—the separation of which from the body is used to express the state after death.

2. That the words "Ghost" (*pneuma*, spirit) and "soul" (*ψυχή*) are used interchangeably, meaning and including that which God imparted to man at his creation. "And God breathed into man the breath of life and man became a living soul."

3. That in each case the Bible speaks of yielding up—returning—to God that which he had breathed into man at his creation. Hence these passages are only the abstract statement of the truth uttered by the Wiseman: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it." (Eccl. 12 : 7). The conclusion therefore is that the immortality of the soul is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures. But let us notice

IV. *The Practical Results of the Doctrine of the immortality of the soul.*

The kingdom of God is one of foretastes and fruitions on the one hand, and of premonitions and warnings on the other. Every important doctrine of the Bible therefore affords a basis for present comfort and edification for some, while to others it brings the convictions of guilt and condemnation. And this is even more true of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul than of some other cardinal doctrines of the Bible. For to this fundamental doctrine of the Bible we must look as the basis,

1. For the doctrine of the future rewards and punishments.

For without future life or conscious existence—without immortality—there could be no capacity either to enjoy rewards or to suffer punishments. Without immortality utter annihilation would be the only alternative. Without the doctrine of the immortality of the soul the inspiring assurance of David (Ps. 18 : 15): "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy with thy likeness," would be worse than a wild speculation. Or that of St. John (1. John 3 : 2): "It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is;" and his sublime description of heaven (Rev. 21 : 10-27) would be an absurd delusion. But for the doctrine of immortality, the Wiseman's declaration (Prov. 14 : 32): "The righteous hath hope in his death"—and our Lord's promise (John 14 : 2): "In my Father's house are many mansions. * * and * * I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also"—would be a base falsehood.

On the other hand, but for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the wicked would not fear and tremble at the approach of death, and we should never hear of death-bed repentance; or of sinners crying out: "Men and brethren what shall we do to be saved," or with contrite hearts crying: "Lord be merciful to me a sinner." But for this doctrine we should not have heard the wicked Voltaire, on the very verge of eternity, exclaim: "I look behind me and all is dark; I look before me and all is dark; soon I shall make a leap into the dark." But for this doctrine we should not have heard of the Rich Man in "Hades" calling to Abraham in Paradise to send Lazarus to him to cool his parching tongue; (Luke 16 : 24). Nor the two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, and saying: "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 18 : 28, 29). No, but for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul we should have none of these premonitions of the future state of torment. But as a practical result of this great doctrine of God the people of God have a rich experience in this life, cheering and inspiring every part of their being into the more

perfect activities of life, while the unsaved are bearing about with them the conviction of judgment to come. The righteous do have hope in death. They do peer into the future with bright anticipation of the time when they shall realize the fruition of their faith and sacrifices. In view of this doctrine we can appreciate more fully the Psalmist's cheering language: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil," and catch new inspiration from John's thrilling description of the state of the blessed in that city whose builder and maker is God. (Rev. 21 : 10-27). And as they approach the transaction from the life in the body to that in glory join in the apostle's song of triumph: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? * * But thanks be unto God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

On the other hand in view of this doctrine the wicked tremble at the very thought of death and the judgment. Men flee from the wrath which is to come, and make their peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. It moves men to forsake him who begets falsehood and hatred, and to embrace Him who fills our very lives with truth and love. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul places a stigma upon sin and uncleanness, and blights the hopes and aspirations of the vile. It puts a premium upon righteousness and a libel upon unrighteousness. As such this fundamental doctrine of the Bible becomes the ruling monitor of the world. It becomes the real basis of safety and joy to the faithful in this life and of their reward in glory; of restraint to the lawless in this life and of their just deserts in eternity. In this is served a divine purpose in this great doctrine, seldom, if ever, properly appreciated, if at all apprehended, by the common mind. And hence the doctrine of the immortality of the soul becomes the basis,

2. Of our Civil and Religious Liberty. The great fundamental principles of all law in this life are vested in this doctrine. Without these principles in law every thought of submission and of obedience would vanish as the dew of the morning. But the principles of this doctrine in the very law of our being beget our intuitive convictions of right and wrong. And by

these men are moved to submission and obedience. And both the moral and civil law find in these principles the basis of operation. As a practical result of the doctrine of immortality men are intuitively moved to respect both the law of God and man, submit to and obey them. Hence under the preaching of the Gospel some are moved to a holy life, their very being becomes radiant with cheer, their lives sweetened by the love and grace of God, and their future bright with the hope of his glory. Others by the same intuitive impulses are restrained from sin and lawlessness by the threat of condemnation and consequent woe and misery. Why? Certainly not for what there is in this life, either of hope or of condemnation. For if in this life only we had hope all would unite in fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah (22 : 13): "*Let us eat and drink ; for to-morrow we shall die.*" But all are actuated by the fundamental principles of the doctrine of immortality. It is the thought of the future which begets these profound convictions of right and wrong, and such a profound respect for both the moral and civil law. It is because both of these, together with our intuitive convictions, assert that,

"It is not all of life to live,
Nor all of death to die!"

that the principles of civil and religious liberty find a response in the human heart. Or, as another has put it, "because all the laws of this life are but the indices of the future administration of justice, men respect and obey them." The thought of immortality begets in the hearts of men every principle of true patriotism and therefore loyalty to their country's laws, and reverence for their father's God, both for the joy and the honor there is in such a life on earth and for the hope of the fruition of such a life to come. The thought of immortality is to the law of our body politic what the backbone is to the human body. The hope of infinite felicity as a future reward for the life of faith and obedience, gives stability of character to the good, while the thought of judgment to come, forces restraint and submission on the part of the bad. To all comes the

thought with greater or less frequency, so vividly expressed by Charles Wesley.

"And must I be to judgment brought,
And answer in that day
For every vain and idle thought,
And every word I say?

Yes, every secret of my heart
Shall shortly be made known,
And I receive my just desert
For all that I have done."

Or the intuitive conviction, as by inspiration, (Rev. 20 : 12): "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." The doctrine of immortality alone gives these truths their great power in both the civil and the moral law.

3. The doctrine of immortality becomes the Christian's mighty fortress.

"The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it and is safe,"* is a truth which gives inspiration not alone to this life, but quickens aspirations for that which is to come. It gives buoyancy amid the trials and sacrifices of this life, and brilliancy to the hope of the future. "The righteous hath hope in his death," as a promise, has given strength to "many weak and sickly" in their struggles for victory over sin, and given new powers of faith to many doubting ones. The doctrine of immortality is the firm anchorage to every Christian's hope. It is the one star which shines brightest in his soul—it "shines more and more unto the perfect day." Immortality! As a doctrine it inspires courage in every Christian's breast, and has made heroes of cowards and cowards of heroes. Luther on his way to Worms, when dissuaded by his friends, said: "I will go to Worms, though there be as many devils there as there are tiles on the houses' roofs." But the great Voltaire quaked as he contemplated his doom. Paul sang his

*Prov. 18 : 10.

hymn of triumph at a martyr's block, while devils trembled in the presence of their Lord. *Immortality!* The assurance of it is the motive power which is pushing the train of Gospel truth into every land and clime, and giving efficacy to the teaching and preaching of it among all classes and conditions of men. The assurance of it is moving men to speak the language of heaven in over three hundred of the tongues of earth, and giving the Word of God by seventy millions of voices to five times as many ears. The assurance of it is opening the way for the message of salvation to all the people, and has made possible the advanced religious state so beautifully described by our beloved Dr. Sprecher: "We live amid the blessed results of Christianity. The leaven, so little when first inserted, is rapidly fermenting, and will soon leaven the entire mass of humanity. The mustard seed, so small, has sprung into a great tree, affording leaves for the healing of the nations, and extending its branches for a shelter to the weak and helpless, and affording a cooling shade for the rest of those who 'labor and are heavy laden.'" The kingdom first promised to a little flock, has extended its boundaries far and wide, exerting its benign influences over the civilized and the barbarous, the learned and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the high and the low; blessing the king upon his throne, and the peasant in his cottage; purifying the centres of civilization, and pursuing men with its conservative and elevating power to the utmost verge of human society. Many centuries have past since this kingdom was promised by the Great King to the "little flock." Meantime earthly thrones have been erected and overturned, kingdoms have been established and destroyed, nations have risen and fallen, and others now exist, in turn to be swallowed up by the billows of time; but triumphant and high above the storm and the waves has stood this heavenly kingdom, ever growing in power and glory; and thus it will stand until "great voices shall be heard from heaven," proclaiming that "the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ." Aye! and the doctrine of the immortality of the soul has made it all possible.

Immortality! The assurance of it is turning the eyes of the world upon Him who "hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." And notwithstanding the fact that the infidel host is scoffing at the Gospel of peace and reconciliation, the assurance of immortality is speeding the time when "every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father:" And when the Christian world can join Paul most heartily in his testimony of triumphs: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give me at that day: And not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. 4 : 7-8. Ah, yes! Thank God for this cardinal doctrine of the Bible—that of the immortality of the soul.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE STANDARD OF MINISTERIAL SCHOLARSHIP.

BY REV. C. F. SANDERS, A. M.

One question is always supreme in the mind of every man whose ambition is worthy of the respect of his fellowmen. That one question, in its varied forms of application, is, How may I meet the requirements of my calling? It is important that this question should be prominent in the mind of men of every vocation, but it is fundamental with the calling to the gospel ministry. For the man who has been moved by the Holy Spirit to enter the gospel ministry there is nothing so burning in the depths of his soul as the taking of the world for Christ. He intuitively connects the longing of his soul with the part he is to play in its consummation. He looks out upon the world in which the Church has been struggling for so many centuries. He sees the record of many characters in every respect far nobler than himself. Their accomplishments appear of prodigious proportions in comparison with what he can trust himself to hope to realize in his own life, and yet along side of the great un-

leavened mass even the heroes of all the ages have accomplished comparatively little. He sees faith of dazzling altitude, consecration of surpassing fervor, and laborious accomplishments that surpass conception. Almost appalled he nerves himself for his lot in life by the observation: These great men whose testimony comes down through the ages let go of the world, laid hold on the Almighty hand of God, and by the power of the Spirit given them accomplished great things for their God by consecrated, self-denying, labor.

Every age brings with it its own peculiar problems that must be met, and can only be met, in the process of their development. The great work of Luther could not have been done in the age of Augustine, and the great Augustine would have been a poor substitute for Luther. Döllinger's protest had no place before the council of the Vatican in 1870. There is, however, one unchanging quality that has been and ever will be perpetuated through all the annals of time as a supreme element of success in every labor in the Master's vineyard. It is living faith in God by which the power of the Holy Ghost becomes the mighty factor in the labors of the individual man. This discussion will take this faith for granted, and lest we be misunderstood, emphasize the truth that all other qualifications come after the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and are effectual in proportion as they are permeated by the Spirit's presence.

Galileo's discoveries produced a revolution in the learning of his day, but they stand as the first tints of the early dawn to the noonday sun, when compared with the transformation that has been wrought in the world by the discoveries of Watt, Morse, and Edison. It is a truism which requires no argument that we must dispose of the problems the age has brought us. With the conviction that the Church is the kingdom developing in time to endure into eternity, and that Christ will come to receive it to himself when his purpose of evangelization has been accomplished, we must be anxious to meet the problems of our age in the manner best suited to bring about the world's redemption. To the end that the Church be not put to shame, that Christ's return be not delayed, we pray for the speedy solution of every

and each intervening problem. With bated breath has the world looked on, during the present generation, as the hurricane of the world's progress has flung doors open at every hand leading into new fields, with larger opportunities and graver responsibilities. The genius of the world belongs to the nations that are denominated Christian. The rich coffers of nature's great treasury are being unlocked by Christian hands. Storm, lightning, and fire are the tamed servants of the enlightened Christian nations. The walls that once secluded pagan peoples are thrown down and in every nation is heard the wonderful works of God in its peculiar tongue. The hand of God is in the war now waging. The believer in Divine Providence cannot doubt this. It is one of the doors opening that will transform the maps of the world, and effect an opening for Christianity in several quarters of the globe. The partition of Africa, the rise of Japan, &c., &c., indicate extraordinary possibilities to the present age. The problems before us are incitements to activity. Our fitness to cope with them will appear from a glance at the rank and file as well as at the officers of our army.

We shall here touch upon the salient characteristics of the times, and note the influences and forces at work in the world.

The most casual observer must see that the age is intensely materialistic. Men are worshipping at the shrine of wealth. The Klondyke opens and the thoroughfares of travel are crowded with an anxious throng that has not counted the cost. The only sacrifice that is prominent is the willing and ready sacrifice of everything that stands in the way of getting much gain. If it be integrity of character, if it be the divine law of respect for truth, if it be God's institution of one day in seven to be kept holy, that be in the way to getting gain, it must scornfully be trodden upon. This spirit to get rich at all hazards is far too common not to belong to the *Zeitgeist*. It is at the bottom of all the social turmoil. It will, in large measure, account for the depopulating of rural districts and the crowding of the cities with poor. It is fostered by an accursed social ostracism. We bewail the class distinctions of the Brahmanic religion, but never

blush for the lines that distinguish and hopelessly separate the rich and the poor in the land where universal human brotherhood is professed.

Next to the rage for gold is the rush for the novel. The world is demanding entertainment where education should find a place. Desserts and pastry are supplanting substantial foods. The daily press is a fearful commentary on the present generation speaking forth for the ages to come its condition of civilization. With what unblushing colors does it paint the stories—both real and fictitious—of vice and criminality to poison the minds, insult the sense, and corrupt the tastes of the reading public and particularly the young. What amazing disproportion between the substantial literature of to-day and the poisonous trash that is thrust out upon an unguarded public. This is not so because our writers are less pure than they should be. It is so because that is the kind of literature the public demands. A boycott of impure literature would work wonders in purifying the press. The desire for the theatric has become dictatorial. The writer that will not entertain by such productions as appeal to the passions, is soon laid on the shelf. But what has this to do with the subject in hand? It illustrates the powerful tyranny that rules among us in these days. It is what Bryce denominates the tyranny of popular opinion. The learned Döllinger, speaking of this tendency in the United States calls it a power so dominant that all are expected to bow to it as if it were an absolute monarch. It has been suggested that the authorship of the Pentateuch may yet be submitted to a popular vote. A pastor recently inquired of Dr. Stuckenberg what he should do in view of conditions in his congregation which placed him in the dilemma of either withholding part of the truth or of emptying his church. A man of considerable information remarked to the writer not long ago, "It is a matter of bread and butter with the ministry, they dare not express themselves too freely." Paul might have had a pleasant time at Jerusalem had he avoided the remark pertaining to his mission to the Gentiles. He was loyal to the truth and paid for his loyalty by being severely beaten right under the shadow of the Temple. The

power and tendency of majorities as the cause of the pulpit travesty known as *sensationalism*. I will not ask space here to show how *sensationalism* works and proves the condition of the popular mind. You can do this for yourself by watching the Saturday papers announcing preaching subjects for the following Sabbath, and follow them up in the reports that appear on Monday. The tyrant Majority has instituted an inquisitorial reign. He demands the submission of everything to his judgment as the ultimate tribunal. He asserts himself as the supreme law of right. He turns a deaf ear to the muse of history as she would show him his error, and the sandy foundation of his throne. In final analysis the dictatorship of majorities would read something like this: "The ultimate basis of everything is the decision of the majority;" and it is an open secret that the majority decision is largely controlled by ignorance and prejudice.

But it is unfair to characterize the age as wholly given to the novel and exciting. We have many writers that claim to be scientific and they have a host of readers. There are a few things to which we need here to give attention. Many professors of science and philosophy have not mastered their subjects. Many have started without faith in God. Many have had to depend upon the market for their literary production for a livelihood. The first have produced a vast literature that is unsound. The second have fostered the materialistic spirit of the age and have had a reflex exerted upon themselves by the spirit of the age; their productions have been approved, eagerly read, and the tribunal of the majority has been an incentive to their activities. Connected with the third characteristic the majority has made a materialistic train of thought a lucrative profession. It has recently been asked, does agnosticism pay? It was answered: Ingersoll lectured to a \$1200 house the other night at ——. The full force of this kind of literature is not fully felt until we recall the fact that this is an age of many readers and much reading. It will not be harsh criticism to say that the majority of the readers are incapable, at the beginning at least, to distinguish between the true and the false in philosophy and

science. With a relish for the mysterious, which seems to have been common with man in every age of his history, there is a relish for science and philosophy. These things will largely determine the course of the reader, and there can scarcely be a doubt as to the result. Intellectual capacity, notoriety of author, cost of the books, will decide as to the works to be read. Far-away Moses is a very attractive writer, and has a style that is easily understood by the untrained mind, but he is a miserable philosopher, if we may be permitted to use even that term. The profound treatment of the great problems of philosophy are all of an intensely, yea severely thoughtful nature. They must of necessity be so. But this necessity has closed them from the popular mind. It is also to be noted that notoriety has often come in most inglorious ways when viewed from the standpoint of the truth. In a wicked world, tending to the materialistic, and sensual, it will be easy to determine who are the popularly notorious. This again makes for the false philosopher. It is quite singular, too, that the writers that have spun their false theories in such attractive style have put their productions upon the market very cheap. I can get Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* for twenty five cents, but I can't get a good, thorough and safe analysis of, and answer to it, under about two and a half dollars. The consequence is a large circulation of dangerous literature without anything to counteract its influence.

A noble writer across the waters has characterized the age in doleful language, as the day in which "faith has fled." We are never quick to accept any such dark commentary on the times in which we live. But however unwilling we may be to have our age present a dark picture, we certainly cannot get away from facts. I am charged with pessimism. But it is surely vain to cry peace when there is no peace. When Lee crossed the Potomac for the purpose of an invasion of the Northern States the greatest alarm prevailed. It was not because the North feared a depleted army cut off from its base of supplies, but the devastation which would result from the progress of a pillaging host, and the possible danger of the materializing of threatened uprisings in the North which would give strength to the enemy.

So in this age, as a lover of Zion, I apprehend no danger, nor I entertain no fear, of the enemy in the open field. This rock upon which I stand, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail, is still as firm as the throne of the eternal heavens. But I am full of alarm because the enemy of souls has invaded the holy hill of the Lord, and what was threatened has taken place: Many who were on the rock have lifted anchor and are now the most dangerous enemies to the faith. The congress of Liberal Religions is not an unmeaning movement in this age. Lyman Abbott can do the cause of a pure Church more harm by far than Col. Ingersoll.

The gospel of Fate that is inspired by the shallow science and philosophy of the times, by becoming popular, has come into the Church while the watchman slept. "Assent to doctrine has taken the place of a life conformed to the life of Christ. Two distinct ideas of Christianity result. One of them magnifies doctrine and its great sin, which is heresy. The other magnifies obedience to person, and its great sin, which is disobedience. The one enthrones a creed; the other a person. The Christianity of the New Testament is of the second sort; that of to-day largely of the first." A bewilderment, which in its weariness has reclined on the bosom of Fate, is the fruit. If this statement is denied, let the denier give account for the immense number of suicides and murders that are annually occurring all around us. If the assertion is not true who will account for the fearful clashing between labor and capital. True it is and the very quarter from which denial comes is evidence that it is true. It is proven by corrupt politics, the liberal patronage of a degraded theatre and the open saloon, that gateway to the confines of eternal hell is in itself sufficient proof that our professed Christian citizenship is not actuated by conformity to Christ. However strongly men may protest by profession, it is their life that proclaims most loudly their faith. This, however, is inveighing against the Church in a manner which may receive the answer; admitting all these evils, they are not the deeds of the Church. It is true, the Church has not overtly championed the cause of the licensed saloon, nor

preached the doctrine of Fate. It is here, however, that her life will give better proof of the essence of her faith than all her volumes of creeds. The evils are admitted, for they are not a secret. The admission of the evils at once involves the Church, for they could not exist without the patronage of at least part of professed Christendom. The Church involved, she must answer for the manner in which she manifested her concern for the souls entrusted to her keeping. Here we spontaneously look for a solid front of Christendom against the evils of the day, but lo, it is not there. On the other hand there is evidence abundant that the brother's hand is against the hand of his brother, and the sister against her sister. Ephraim is jealous of Benjamin, Benjamin quarrels with Judah. Confusion results in Israel; meanwhile Philistia regales herself, and almost unconsciously the seed of Abraham finds itself worshipping Dagon of Gath. The age is characterized by sharp denominational rivalry. Churches are reckoned powerful in proportion to numbers, spirituality not taken into account. With spirituality below par and numbers the *summum bonum*, the only possible result is a church weighted with numbers and robbed of spirituality. I would not be understood as speaking under the influence of peculiar local conditions. I am fully aware that local conditions will favorably compare with any in the land. The conditions are prevalent, and because prevalent, dangerous. With three hundred that were faithful Gideon put to flight the host of Midian. Had he gone with his thirty thousand indiscriminately he must have failed.

I wish yet to press this argument nearer home, right to the place where it causes me the greatest distress. In this day when problems that involve life and death are thick all around, the subject that has affected our own Church, and the only subject apparently that has made any intense impression, was that of ritual. I see a picture in illustration. It is of a sinking vessel a few leagues from shore. The bugler from the life-saving station calls to the crew that help will be on as soon as they have arranged to come in the manner of their fathers and neighbors in the business, for if they shall be saved, it must be in a

manner that is uniform with the methods by which others have been saved. Slowly the life boat pulls out from shore much busied in the arrangement of robes and other non-essential appointments. All the while many of the passengers succumb to the cold and are being swept away by the angry waves, and do you blame their expiring breath that curses the life-saving institutions that cherish appointments more dearly than life!

The student of history cannot get away from the fact that the tendency to increase, and the excessively rigid adherence to ritual, has always gone hand in hand with spiritual declension in religion. The distress in which religion was at the time Christ came was in large measure its excessive ceremonialism. The indulgences that applied the flame to the tinder at the Reformation period grew out of a church burdened with ceremony but dead spiritually. It is again significant that there has never been any revival in religion brought about by any great ritualist—*i. e.* anyone who regarded ritual in any respect fundamental.

If I have now succeeded in presenting an uninviting picture, I have accomplished my intention. Further, I think I have then accomplished a true representation. It is this truth which should urge the necessity of a highly educated gospel ministry. Religious papers and magazines for more than a year have reiterated the question: Is not the ministry overcrowded? The invariable answer was, there is abundant room for more who are properly fitted and consecrated to the service of the Master. And then, how humiliating, about a year ago to read the letter of Dr. Severinghaus in the *Lutheran World* stating that two pastors in the East had made a joint request for the title of Doctor of Divinity at the rate of \$25.00 each, assuming to mitigate their presumption by saying that they might be mutually helpful.

The situation calls for master minds. The best mind will require the severest discipline. The risks are immortal souls. Any standard of preparation for service lower than the highest is unworthy of a man in any calling; in the the gospel ministry it is a disgrace. Hegel says: "If you would refute error you must erect the standard of the truth and carry it into the citadel

of the opponent. It avails nothing to make external attacks, where the enemy himself is not, and where a victory does not affect him." Anyone who is not trained to severe thinking is unfit to do battle as an undershepherd of the blessed Master in these times. Shallowness has in part invited the evils of which we have spoken. Because of it opinions have been preached where nothing short of conviction should have been given a place. There is a mighty difference between opinion and conviction. "Opinions may change and the world be better for the change, truth is divine and is worth dying for. Christianity has not to do with opinions; it is founded on established facts and divine truth and faith based thereon is the heritage of the Church." If you would confine the flooding mountain torrent to its proper channel, or stay its course, you must place over against it a solid wall higher than the surface of the water. To stay the destructive tendencies in the current of modern thought, it must plainly have placed over against it thinking more powerful than the destructive current and reaching higher into the realm of the truth. To offer resistance that will be swept away will only increase the fury of the torrent as it rushes over the wreck of your feeble attempt at resistance. The preacher for these times must have such a mastery of science and philosophy as to be able to let the searchlight of the divine truth so shine in upon the false theories as to discover their error, so as to save his flock from being misled. Cicero said the orator should know everything, and it may be said that the preacher *must* know more than the orator. We don't preach science nor philosophy but we guide the scientist and the philosopher into the truth.

We must know history. The past has produced the present and its story will unfold the possibilities of the future. It is only he who has tasted deeply at the fountain of History that will fully comprehend the wonderful providence of God in preserving the faith amid the strife imposed by a hostile world. It contains the progressional revelation of God, and to be ignorant of its profound lessons is to be deficient in the knowledge of God's revelation of himself. It is the confirmation of the promises of

God and the fulfillment of the prophecies. Faith will be thereby strengthened, hope refined, and persecution for Christ's sake will be more easily borne. It is only by a comprehensive knowledge of history that the spirit of Christianity can possibly be known. It is the only means of inspiration for the future.

We must *know* theology. A superficial knowledge of the subject of the eternal decrees has taught that which has produced the fatalism and universalism of our age, and it is only a short step from either of these to atheism. Misconception of the relation between faith and works is responsible for indulgences and all the train of evils connected with them, and degrades salvation by grace to the level of human accomplishment.

Looseness on the subject of Sanctification has produced the perfectionist heresy; incorrect ideas with respect to the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit has brought upon us faith healers, Christian Scientists and a long train of petty sects. We might thus go on to show how almost every one of the fundamentals of theology has been perverted.

Surpassing all else in importance is a thorough acquaintance with God's Word, the Holy Scriptures. Philip Schaff has said the book the preacher must thoroughly know is the Bible. Other knowledge will be valuable to diagnose the situation, to understand the needs, but the Bible only and the Bible emphatically will contain the remedy.

There is then only one course open for the man who has responded to the divine call to enter the gospel ministry, and that one course is a life earnestly devoted to study. In order to be at home, and without embarrassment to issue orders on every field, the commander must know the field and the means for victory. He will then survey carefully, and survey universally, and stand by the Book.

ARTICLE IX.

ELY'S "SOCIAL LAW OF SERVICE."

BY REV. FRANK P. MANHART, A. M.

The chapters of Prof. Ely's work have the following headings: Our Firm Foundation, Our Point of View, The Relations of the Old and New Testaments Socially Considered, The Social Law of Service, The Social Significance of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, Social Solidarity, Our Neighbors, The State, Making Men Good by Law, Inadequacy of Private Philanthropy for Social Reform, Our Earnings, Our Spendings and What to Do.

Dr. Ely finds the *foundation* of the law of social service to be Christ's teaching of love to God and love to man. The most powerful social force is religion. Our religion is a living personality, it is Christ, a leader meek beyond comparison, yet unequaled in strength. He taught us the divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood, so as Christians we must desire social righteousness.

The *view-point* is that of Christ, that is, *Love*, and more especially, the love of man to man. Christ was the first philanthropist. No other religion knows any true philanthropy. Buddhism, Stoicism * * all fail, here. Paul says, "we are members one of another." "Untruthfulness is an offense against our fellowship in Christ."

The *Law of Service* in the Old and New Testament is based upon the purpose of their laws to glorify God through the welfare of man in society. Jewish history, religion, separateness, election, wars and laws—all illustrate this. In the New Testament Jewish laws and religion were enlarged into universal human relations and brotherhood. The giving of the Holy Spirit, the extension and intension of ethical obligation, the basis of the Last Judgment, (Matt. 25) the doctrine of stewardship and of the neighbor, and especially Christ's doctrine of the kingdom of God all prove that in the New Testament the divine law of

service is the glorifying of God by promoting the welfare of man.

The *social law of service* is the law of love. The motto of chap. 4, sets it forth: "Therefore come what may hold fast to love. Though men should rend your heart, let them not embitter or harden it. We win by tenderness, we conquer by forgiveness. O! strive to enter into something of that large celestial charity which is meek, enduring, unretaliating, and which even the overbearing cannot withstand forever. Learn the new commandment of the Son of God. Not to love merely, but to love *as He loved*. Go forth in this spirit to your life duties; go forth, children of the cross, to carry everything before you, and win victories for God by the conquering power of a love like his." F. W. Robertson.

Baptism is the method whereby we enter into relations with our fellows and form the Church of Christ. "All one body we." Baptism is the continual witness to a common humanity united in God. To those who accept baptismal regeneration, infant baptism recalls the fact that Christ proposed a universal kingdom, into which infant baptism is a naturalization. It points to the solidarity of the family in the kingdom.

In the *Lord's Supper*, bread and wine are used because they admirably typify fraternity—Bread is made of many grains, wine of many grapes, so the multitude of Christians are joined to Christ and each other. Cranmer. The Godward side of the Lord's Supper draws toward heaven—to be "partakers of his most blessed body and blood." On the manward side men are drawn to their fellows, they fellowship. Equality swallows up inequality. Christians are inspired with ceaseless activity for the redemption of the world. The use of individual communion cups is disheartening, as thereby the meaning of the Lord's Supper is half lost.

The rituals of the churches and the hymns do not neglect the social side of the Eucharist. The Holy Grail is found by all who remember that millions of men are needlessly sad, needlessly tormented and tortured daily, and who then walk in the

footsteps of Christ, in that they like him live to serve their fellows.

Social Solidarity means the oneness of social interests. This is now understood as never before. The blood of the race flows in every man and prove man's oneness physiologically. The microbe is a social leveler. The interests of any one man or class of men are the interests of every man and of all men. The kingdom sought by Christians is a social state. Christians are "one body in Christ and every one members of one another. True individuality is built up, not in isolation, but in society."

Our Neighbors are men in need. There should be in centres of education, in trade, in contests of labor and capital, and in international relations, an enthusiasm of humanity. It is only an unbelieving age that asserts the sufficiency and benevolence of self-interest.

The *State* is a continuous, conscious organism, and a moral personality, which has its foundations laid in the nature of man. It is formed for the sake of life and continued for the good life. (Aristotle). The Reformation did away with the false distinctions of secular and sacred, and declared the magistrate, his powers, laws and sword holy. The main purpose of the state is religion, therefore it should promote the well being of all its subjects physically, mentally and religiously. The Church may place ideals ahead of the state for it gradually to approach. It places the emphasis on duties rather than rights. Christians of all types act together officially for the establishment of righteousness.

Men are *Made good by Law*, by the method of indirection. Laws secure person and property, regulate industry, free slaves, provide universal education, maintain penal and reformatory institutions, and in short, embody the national conscience, and furnish millions nearly all of the ideas of morality. Much more can be done by the indirect method of law making, when laws are not only negative, repressive and mandatory, but also attractive and persuasive.

In the remaining chapters Dr. Ely contends, that while much

has been done in education, reform and philanthropic measures generally, and while much more may yet be done by private philanthropy; yet it has been and must be inadequate, and the state must bear the brunt of philanthropy in its many-sided activities.

In the matter of *Our Earnings*, the true ideal is found in the prayer of Agur: Give me neither poverty nor riches. Each has its peculiar dangers. Earnings as regards the individual, must have reference to his body, mind and soul; as regards society they must recognize the solidarity of the race under present day conditions.

In *Our Spendings* the supreme law is mutual love. Beginning with self and family the circles must expand until the whole should be included. Our spendings include material wealth, personal service and all our powers.

The question *What to do?* is answered by many suggestions. Bring yourself into right relations with God, then seek right relations with men. Keep close to Christ, whether rich or poor. Do the next thing. Seek light. The first social circle is the family. It is the social cell. Its building up or decay are of infinite moment. The Church is a social circle that must leaven all, so work in it. Her ideal is a transforming power for righteousness—rightness—right relations towards God and man. The ultimate ideal presented by the Prophets and Revelation is the Church as the all-embracing form of association for every kind of social work; this means a oneness of Church and State. Our work in the Church is the redemption of the world, not the plucking of a few out of the world. Everywhere the Church should have trained workers among the poor and needy. Apply the moral truths to social labor, economic and governmental questions.

"Without reverence and love citizenship cannot exist." We must have a feeling for our city, and country like that which is inculcated in the Bible. Our Jerusalem must be so dear to us that we can say, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her coming." Then our commonwealth will be regenerated.

To the rapid, though it is hoped, just and suggestive summary, of Dr. Ely's chapters, a few observations may be added.

1. There is noticeable a marked affinity with the Lutheran view of nature as sharing the blessings of redemption.

2. A more adequate theological conception of so much of the nature and person of Christ as is indicated in the title Son of Man, would have aided to clearer ideas of the race's solidarity of kinship with Him, as the basis of the social law of service for the life that now is and the judgment that will settle destiny for the life that is to come.

3. The Deaconess work of the Lutheran Church was in the the mind of the author as he wrote parts of his book. The task, however, does not show that familiarity with the doctrines and spirit of the Lutheran Church that it does with the Methodist or Episcopal Churches; or, possibly, less attention is given to her teachings and practices because they seem to our author to be of less importance in American religious life.

4. His tenacious advocacy of the higher educational institutions of the state as over against those of the Church will find many objectors; still what he says is too important to be ignored by the friends of higher education under church control.

5. Dr. Ely might have found Luther as fully "up to date" and as quotable on questions of earnings, business and economics, as he did Wesley, had he taken equal pains to find what the greater man had said.

6. As Dr. Ely came to the Scripture with the personal faith of the Christian, the economist and sociologist and the zeal of a reformer, it is not surprising that he found so much to justify the position of one who, in a noble sense, is a Christian socialist. This however need not make the work less valuable to us who do not agree with all of its positions.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Christian Pastor and the Working Church. By Washington Glad-den, D. D., LL. D. pp. 485. Price \$2.50 net.

This is a work on Pastoral Theology. While the subject is an old one, its treatment is fresh and vigorous. At many points the author leaves the beaten track and carves out a path for himself. He believes that in consequence of the advancement of civilization the condition of the Church has undergone a change, that new problems present themselves, and that there are new duties and activities which call for new methods, and his aim is to show how this changed condition of the Church is to be met and what methods are to be employed. A statement from Dr. Parkhurst serves him for a motto, "The Church is no longer the pastor's field, but the pastor's force;" he emphasizes the idea that the "Church is a working body, that it is formed not mainly of those who seek to be fed and ministered unto, but of those who are working together to extend the Kingdom of God."

A glance at some of the headings of the chapters will show the range of the topics discussed: The Pastor in his Study; Pulpit and Altar; The Church Organization; The Mid-week Service; Parish Evangelization; The Social Life of the Church; Woman's Work in the Church; The Young Men and Women; The Institutional Church. In the presentation of these topics the author discloses extensive reading and research and a deep insight into the needs of the human soul. The style is clear, original and suggestive, and the work abounds in pithy, sententious utterances which rivet the attention and fix the truth.

In speaking of the call to the ministry the writer says, "no minister ought to undertake the work unless he believes he has a divine vocation, but he ought to submit this conviction to the approval of his brethren." What he says concerning large congregations, the selection of a pastor, Choir singing and Church competition should be read and pondered by every pastor and congregation. His rules for meeting religious doubt are exceptionally appropriate. The subject of Deaconess work is fully and discriminatingly discussed. He speaks with favor of Revivals of Religion. He speaks approvingly of Lenten services and thinks all the Churches might observe them with profit. While we do not agree with our author in everything, we can nevertheless commend this volume most heartily to every pastor in the belief that it will stimulate him and aid him in developing his congregation into a working Church.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons.

Studies of the Mind in Christ. By Rev. Thomas Adamson, B. D. pp. 300. \$2.50.

Great, says St. Paul, is the mystery of godliness: He was manifested in the flesh. A mystery is something which transcends human intelligence. This very fact makes it, however, all the more attractive to the human intellect, nor does the impossibility of a solution forbid reverent attempts to solve it.

This work can hardly be classed with such attempts, though it certainly and avowedly wrestles with one of the most profound and perplexing subjects of theological speculation, the relation of human and divine knowledge in the theanthropic personality of the Redeemer. In a style of extreme simplicity, with not a single technical expression, in a spirit of reverence and candor, with an unmistakable desire to gain light and to bow to the truth, and in a way to hold the student's interest to the end, the author sets forth in successive chapters, Christ's Ignorance, His Supernatural Knowledge, His Divine Knowledge, His Knowledge of the Old Testament, His Knowledge of the Future, etc., etc.

Startling as sounds the expression "Christ's Ignorance," that is a condition involved in the reality of his human nature. Humanity implies limitations, and we are thus confronted with the fact that Christ had "a true human mind, a mind which worked by the same faculties and within the same limits as ours." The author says point-blank "Our Saviour in his humanity was not omniscient and much of his knowledge was gained by the same means as other men around him might have used."

Even where he treats of Christ's Supernatural Knowledge he does not make that identical with his omniscience. The possession of Supernatural Knowledge is limited to exceptional instances, "a few rarely manifested specimens," "solitary or singular instances, in bursts of light on the usual darkness of true human nature." This Supernatural Knowledge had "a suitable practical end to vindicate it on every occasion in which it was used," "It was to him a sacrament from heaven." "It enlightened the human ignorance of our Lord." "It came for the occasion and was used by him for special ends."

But aside from the occasional impartations of Supernatural Knowledge, which might come to any man, and which "Peter received as really as his Lord," Christ had a knowledge of heavenly things that was "primary and not imparted." "It was not a scrap of superhuman information, but in essence and principles, the very mind, the complete mind of God himself." This knowledge he had by virtue of his own divine nature. Yet even this "did not imply omniscience; its original amount was a very minimum of knowledge, perhaps not more than of himself as divine." It was therefore capable of increase. "The

Father imparted a further revelation, a further revelation of fact in the experience of daily life. To him that had was given." Because his pure heart had anointed eyes "the spirit could be given to him without measure." He acquired because of his loyalty to revelation a store "which the Spirit taught from the revelation supplied by the Father."

For a Knowledge of the Word of God, Jesus Christ, it is claimed, "had no special facilities." There is, however, "ample evidence that he had an extensive Knowledge of the Old Testament." "It opened out to his wondering eye a panoramic record of general principles, all of which appealed to him, and showed the Jehovah of the Old Testament to be the God of his own conscience." "It was to him the very essence of God's will." "The difficulties and apparent contradictions which, then, as now, lay scattered over the face of the Old Testament, were probably not unnoticed by him. But he seems to have felt them as little as the hard matters in his own sayings, which seem strange to us." "They certainly did not affect his faith in the Book itself."

"I presume," says the author, "that Christ had no critical methods or intellectual tests to apply to Scripture, but rather that he used his general intelligence, and those spiritual instincts in which he has ever been unequalled, and even unapproached." "He used the Book just as any good and intelligent man would."

Since nothing in the Book had interest for him but the presence of God and the growth of his spiritual purpose, "we must believe that in speaking of the authorship of any part, he does so in a merely general way, taking the title as in the scroll." If he were proved to be in error on a point like this "that would certainly not discredit him nor the Book." "If he spoke of Moses or David, the reference must be looked on as made for the purpose of identification in regard to the passage." "The authority of the earlier dispensation did not consist in its record being due to Moses, but in its being the earlier dispensation. The appropriateness of a psalm to his case lay not in its being uttered by David but in its being applicable to himself preëminently." The question of authorship is one of literary interest, "and did not in his eyes affect the history of the dispensation of God's grace."

Mr. Adamson neither exploits nor antagonizes any theory or school, but scrupulously following the inductive method, he carries with him the intense interest of his readers and illumines his work page by page with the light of the Holy Scriptures.

EDMUND J. WOLF.

A Dictionary of the Bible dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M. A., and, chiefly in the revision of the proofs, of A. B. Davidson, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh, S. R. Driver, D. D., Litt. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford, H. B. Swete, D. D., Litt. D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Volume I. A — Feasts.

The above, it must be confessed, is a formidable title page, but it is the title page to what promises to be a formidable work—a work which is to consist of 3600 pages, each page containing two columns and each column containing about 700 words. That is, should this work be completed according to the scale on which it has been projected, it will be without doubt, the most comprehensive, learned and accurate dictionary of the Bible in the English Language. Some idea of the compass of the work may be gained from the following extract from the Preface: "Articles have been written on the names of all persons and places, on the Antiquities and Archaeology of the Bible, on its Ethnology, Geology, and Natural History, on Biblical Theology and Ethics, and even on the obsolete and archaic words occurring in the English Versions."

The contributors to this first volume embrace not a few of the very best biblical, theological and antiquarian scholars in Great Britain and America, besides Professor Hommel of the University of Munich. "The names of the authors are appended to their articles, except where the article is very brief and of minor importance; and these names are the best guarantee that the work may be relied on. So far as could be ascertained, those authors were chosen for the various subjects who had made a special study of the subject, and might be able to speak with authority upon it. Then, in addition to the work of the Editor and his Assistant, every sheet has passed through the hands of the three distinguished scholars whose names are found on the title-page."

The five names which adorn the title-page of the first volume are themselves a guarantee for thoroughness and accuracy in biblical scholarship, however we may differ from the theological views which some of them are supposed to represent. Among the "authors" who stand for a conservative theology, are Adeney, Beet, Bernard, Candlish, Orr, Ramsay, Salmond, Sayce, Smith, Isaac Taylor, and Warfield. Among those that represent a liberal tendency, are Brown of Union, Curtis of Yale, Driver of Oxford, Porter of Yale, Thayer of Harvard. We should say that the conservatives and those who represent a reasonably conservative position, are decidedly in the majority. Among those that represent the more liberal tendency, we do not recognize the name of any one who has become distinguished as a destructive critic on the extreme left of the Higher Criticism, though most of the articles pertaining to the Old Testament are written from the standpoint of the Higher

Criticism, as for instance "Deuteronomy" and "Exodus," albeit the spirit is reverent and the authors claim to be "constructive" and not "destructive." "Deuteronomy" as written by President H. E. Ryle, of Cambridge, who reject the Mosaic authorship of the book, and says: "It is generally agreed that the book may have been written in the reign of Manassah, or in the early part of the reign of Josiah." "Exodus" is furnished by G. Harford Battersby, of Balliol College, Oxford. The author at once assumes that "it is generally possible, if not to distribute the material among four distinct documents, at least to assign it to one or other of four differing schools of writing, Jahwistic, Elohist, Deuteronomic and Priestly, whose relative age is known by the order of the names, the periods of the first two overlapping." The book is regarded as a composite work, made up of various elements put together by a redactor. In the "concluding survey" the author says:

"If we accept the results of this article as in the main correct, we have passed far beyond the boundary of a merely negative criticism. It might be called destructive work to show by detailed proof that we have no contemporary account of the Exodus and subsequent events. But when it is shown that the present narrative is made up of three, so far contrasting with one another as to prove themselves much later in date than the period of which they treat, and the work, not merely of different individuals, but of different schools of historical writing; and when the further step is taken of disentangling, with infinite pains of many laborers in many lands, the several threads of narrative, and recombining them in something like their original connexions, the work of constructive criticism must be held to have been well begun. The summaries will have shown on how many important points the three witnesses are at one. For fuller particulars see Moses, Israel.

But, while it is well to remember that contrasts are not always, or even usually, contradictions, it would be idle to try to belittle the extent of the change of view brought about. We may rather think of it as the drawing back of a veil of illusion which God wisely allowed to hang over the past, until the growth of truer ideas about history both took away the veil, and made men ready to make use of the facts, whose real relations were at least adequately discovered."

No doubt this conclusion comes legitimately from the premises. But we here oppose a most decided *Obsta principiis*. The promises are assumed, rather than proved, and we know that there is "another side" to be heard, before a final verdict can be rendered. Yet as the Higher Criticism has become a fact in the history of Bible study, we may expect to find both its methods and conclusions in a work like the one before us.

The article on Assyria, filling twenty-eight columns, and that on Babylonia, filling thirty-three columns, both by Hommel, are exhaustive. Only the specialist will be inclined to seek further information.

The article on the Bible, by Professor Stewart of the University of St. Andrews, treats, first, of the names, original languages, division and arrangement, canon, text and versions of the Bible; then of the literature, revelation and inspiration. The very latest results of research and criticism are here condensed in twenty-seven columns. The author finds many difficulties connected with the Bible remaining unsolved, and thinks it is the duty of sacred scholarship to finish the work which it has begun.

Baptism is ably treated in a conservative way by Professor Plummer, Master of University College, Durham. The following sounds very Lutheran-like. "At Baptism the infant receives remission of the guilt of original sin, admission to the Christian community, and a title to heavenly gifts to be appropriated afterwards." The article fills thirteen columns.

In an article of twenty-nine columns Rev. Sydney C. Gayford, M. A., of Exeter College, Oxford, discusses the "Church." In twelve columns Professor Curtis, of Yale, exhibits the "Chronology of the Old Testament;" while Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, M. A., fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, devotes forty-three columns to the "Chronology of the New Testament." Rev. Thomas B. Kirkpatrick, M. A., B. D., of Aberdeen, treats "Conscience" in fifteen columns. Twenty-nine columns are claimed by Principal Robertson, of King's College, London, for I. and II. Corinthians. Tutor White, of the University of Durham, gives twenty-four columns to "David". The article on "Eschatology," extending over forty-three columns, is divided between Professor A. B. Davidson, of Edinburgh, Rev. Robert Henry Charles, M. A., of Trinity College, Dublin, and Professor Salmond of Aberdeen. Professor Warfield of Princeton devotes twenty-three columns to "Faith." This is a master piece. We can think of no discussion of the subject in the English language equal to this. If we have liberal theology in some of the other articles, we have the genuine conservation in this one. What could sound more like the orthodoxy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than the following: "It is not faith that saves, but faith in Jesus Christ: faith in any other Saviour or on this or that philosophy or human conceit, or in any other gospel than that of Jesus Christ and him crucified brings not salvation but a curse. It is not, strictly speaking, even faith in Christ that saves, but Christ that saves through faith," p. 837.

The specific references which we have thus made to a few of the leading articles, will afford the reader a fair idea of the fulness and elaborateness of the treatment. Besides, every thought is condensed into the briefest compass, and many familiar words are abbreviated, so as to economize space. The articles on the various subjects connected with Biblical Theology, are not all of equal merit, though they are all able, and command the respect of the reader, even when he does not agree

with the conclusions of all. The articles make one think, and that is the chief value of any discussion.

Neither must the reader expect to find harmony of views in this work. In the treatment of kindred subjects by different authors, who often represent different creeds and tendencies, there are often manifest discrepancies. But as each author's name is appended to his articles, except in the case of a few relatively unimportant articles, the reader always knows who is speaking. Hence he has to consider the authority and standpoint of the author, rather than the "Dictionary" itself.

Another valuable feature of the work is that an extended catalogue of the best literature of the subject is appended to each article. Especially has the German literature been laid under tribute; and this, as well as other features of the work, shows the immense influence which German theological thought is exerting on English and American theological thought. In theology, as in other sciences, the Germans are the school-masters of the world. We can here only record our lament that so few of the young men of our own branch of the Lutheran Church sufficiently master the German language as to be able to utilize its vast treasures of theology.

The book grows in favor with us as we continue to examine it—not because we endorse all or by any means all, that it contains, or think that it has spoken the final word on any of the great subjects of which it treats, or think that it will supplant Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, or Alexander's Kitto's Biblical Cyclopedia, but because it presents the results of careful and learned investigation, and will stimulate, as every such book does, to the production of something still better, for theology, in order to maintain her rank as the queen of the sciences, must ever renew her youth and put on her beautiful garments.

The libraries of ministers and of theological seminaries will not be complete without a copy of this Dictionary of the Bible.

J. W. RICHARD.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation; 1483-1546. By Henry Eyster Jacobs, Dean and Professor of Systematic Theology, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa. Author of "The Lutheran Movement in England during the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and Its Literary Monuments"; "A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States." 1898. pp. 454. Price \$1.50.

The enterprising Putnams have included among their excellent series of biographical and historical works a special series devoted to "Heroes of the Reformation." No one will question the propriety of including Martin Luther in this series, nor even, indeed, that of giving him the distinction we find on the title-page of this book, viz., "the Hero of the Reformation," even though the "the" should be printed in type to indicate emphasis. So conspicuous was his leadership, not only in

beginning the struggle with the papacy but in every step of its progress during his life, that no group of the prominent participants in that great movement would be satisfactory without Luther as the central figure. We say this as a Protestant rather than as a Lutheran, and are quite sure that no Protestant will deny it. How, indeed, can he in view of the tributes paid the great Reformer by the leading Protestants of the worlds?

The life of Luther is given in this volume in comparatively small compass, and that will likely secure for it a wider reading. And yet the reader will find a compactness in its preparation that will satisfy him that nothing of real importance has been omitted. Its author had such facilities at hand in the way of libraries, that he, no doubt, found an "embarrassment of riches," and the sources of all his facts and citations of chief importance are given in foot-notes. He, too, had in hand a familiar subject, made familiar by almost a life-time of study and investigation. In addition to this, he has shown a remarkable skill in reducing to order his great mass of material and a notable conciseness and clearness of expression. There may be a feeling of disappointment, on the part of some readers, because of this compactness and conciseness in giving some of the dramatic incidents in Luther's life, such as his Marburg Colloquy or his heroic deportment at the Diet of Worms. But the prescribed limitations of his work did not allow lengthy descriptions, and we doubt whether Dr. Jacobs has any inclination to indulge in the picturesque style of writing.

The limitations prescribed for the author by the editor may account, too, for the comparatively cursory treatment of the mooted question as to whether the Augsburg Confession was sent by Melancthon to Luther *one, two or three* times, for his inspection and revision, before it was read before Charles V. The first sending is stated plainly enough; the second can be inferred easily enough; but the *third* would not be inferred at all from any statement made on page 296, where the account is given. Perhaps it was intended to let that be a matter *sub judice*. And why may it not as well be so treated? Will not Luther's authorship of the Torgau and the Schwabach Articles, upon which the Augsburg Confession was based, make his relation to the Confession close enough? What if he did not hold the pen that wrote it? He furnished the material to its composer, and most heartily approved of it after it was written and read before the Diet. These are his words: "I am exceedingly glad to have lived to this hour, in which Christ has been preached in so glorious a Confession." What matters it whether he gave his approval immediately before or immediately after its public presentation? That which outweighs everything else is, that he *approved* it, and this is, perhaps, the main thing that Dr. Jacobs aims to tell.

No other biography of Luther has ever made so distinct an impress-

ion of what a busy life Luther's was, and of the enormous amount of work done by him under his adverse conditions. His lectures in the university were enough for one man, and yet, in all the perils of those times, he was ever engaged in writing controversial papers, carrying on public disputations, formulating doctrines, preparing catechisms and orders of worship, preaching, translating the Bible, carrying on an immense correspondence, giving directions for the public schools, giving his views to rulers in matters of civil government, writing hymns, etc., etc., and all this, too, at times when his health was much impaired. The reader is carried along rapidly through the successive stages of Luther's own development and his busy reformatory work with unflagging interest, and with a surprise that his physical powers endured the strain as long as they did.

Much is added to the value of the book by the carefully prepared index and two appendixes, the one giving the author's translation and the editor's analysis of the papal bull against Luther, and the other, Luther's confession. The series is under the careful and competent editorship of Dr. Samuel McCauley Jackson, Professor of Church History in New York University. If we may judge of the whole series by Dr. Jacobs' "Life of Luther," it will be one of exceptional excellence.

P. M. BIKLE.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

Easy Lessons in Vocal Culture and Vocal Expression S. S. Hamill.
pp. 198. 60 cents.

The "essential and non-essential (?) elements" of Vocal Expression are presented in this book in a clear way, and with a reasonable appreciation of their relative importance. The book's material and arrangements are such as to make it helpful to one deprived of a teacher's aid. A teacher could wish no better basis for his class-work than is afforded by the material here found. The frequent drills in Breathing, Articulation and Gesture, which precede every lesson, are a commendable feature of the author's method. This is true, however much we may censure his very unsatisfactory treatment of Gesture. One can not fail to notice a slight overdevelopment, a burdensome subdividing, of some subjects that would, for the purpose of the book, be better treated, if treated in a more general way. The absence of recent developments in teaching expression will be noted. Nor will the reference to them in the Preface, atone for their omission.

The selections of the second part of the book are all standard.

A. B. B. VAN ORMER.

Christian Science and its Problems. By J. H. Bates, Ph. M. 1898, 12 mo., pp. 141. Cloth. Price 50 cts.

This book is directed against "Faith Cure" on its more pretentious side. The writer has sought to meet the passing strange philosophy of

Mrs. Eddy and others by a philosophy whose principles are legitimate.

The first two chapters are devoted to establishing "the Christian view of God and life." The third chapter deals with the peculiar views of Christian Science. In its divisions it takes up the principal doctrines in detail, *e. g.*, Matter is Nothing; The Mortal Mind; God; Fundamental Principles; Science; Evil; Proof Texts. For the Christian Scientist there is no matter. God is Spirit. God is All. So, "God, Spirit being all, nothing is matter." Therefore the problem is to wean "mortal mind" from its belief in matter as real, because to recognize disease, sin, evil, death, is to deny God, omnipotent Good, Life. In conclusion, the author examines a number of "cures" that have been heralded far and wide by the leaders of this movement to justify their position.

The book deserves a favorable reception because of its purpose. If the formal principles of "Christian Science" were better known, there would be comparatively few led away by the glitter of its phenomena. Many would turn away in disgust from the creed, who now pin their faith to the "cures".

The author has not made the most of his opportunity, because of an unhappy obscurity in language and plan. The reader is frequently left in doubt of the writer's application of conclusions and comments. A few rereadings, however, generally clear up the sense. One lays down the book with the conviction that Mr. Bates would have done better with a more extended treatise.

JULIUS F. SEEBACH.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK; CURTS AND JENNINGS, CINCINNATI.

The Best of Browning. By James Mudge, D. D., introduced by Rev. William V. Kelley, D. D.

Robert Browning at one time when asked concerning the truth which he meant to convey by a certain poem, replied that he did not at that time know its meaning, himself, and not having at hand the volume containing the poem, he was obliged to obtain one, and refer to it before interpreting his thought. What more common, with those who write much in treatment of abstruse or spiritual subjects? Yet, even in this enlightened age, there are those who, lacking utterly in power of penetrative thought, and devoid of the poetical imagination, cover their own lack by asserting that Browning himself did not know what he meant. Again, weary of the interrogative assaults of the literary Philistine, Browning turned away inquiry by the assertion that he did not, himself, understand certain of his poems, which deal with a state of his own mind, an attitude of spirit, which must be experienced to be understood. Ever since, the scholastic Philistine flouts and scorns poet and poem, using his imagination only to erect barriers between himself and the poet's magnificent presentation of truth.

To such as these Dr. Mudge does not address himself in the book

before us. His best of Browning is best from the Christian standpoint, and is prepared avowedly for the Christian thinker: the busy minister and the intelligent layman. He presents Browning the theologian and Christian, rather than Browning the artist. Yet, he includes in his selections many of the poems which the great poet himself selected as his best, and which are universally acknowledged to be the finest by competent judges of literature. It is true that we miss from the volume any special reference to the fine local color and the realistic setting of some of Browning's lighter work, features to which the coming age of literature must yield a louder applause than it has yet won. And we could have wished, in Dr. Mudge's references to Browning as an artist, that he had called attention to the ease with which he wheels a long Latin derivative into his metre, and to his striking use of onomatopoeic rhythm, as the prattling measure of "Saul," where the boy David tells the story of comforting the great king. Or, the gallop of the verse in the poem, "Through the Metidja to Abdel Kader," where the expressiveness of the rhythm might stand alone. Here the single rhyme does duty through five eight-line stanzas; and as the poet brings the lone and anxious rider on through the darkening desert, the anapestic measure rings monotonously like the hoof-beats of a galloping horse. But as we read the book we are in part compensated for these omissions by the evidence that nothing is lacking in Dr. M's notes because of his own want of appreciation; but rather that he has not thought such references necessary to the particular end in view.

The book opens with an introduction by Rev. William V. Kelly, D. D. To such an introduction or preface in a work of a purely literary character, we object on general principles. No reader wishes to have his opinions formed for him in advance by assurances as to what he shall find in the pages before him. And Dr. Kelly's introduction is particularly objectionable in that it gives the opinion of various persons concerning Browning as a poet. The persons quoted all assert that Browning was a great poet, without indicating his great characteristics, or, giving any reason for the formation of such an opinion. Dr. Kelly professes to set up a court of inquiry, and to place various personages on the witness-stand. But the learned Dr. should remember that the bare expression of opinions is not allowed on the witness-stand to any not first proved to be experts in the matter in question; and who does not already know that Browning was a great poet and worthy of study, will not be able to guess that Dr. Kelly is bringing expert testimony on that point. In a word, the introduction is from the standpoint of the impressionist, and should not have found room in so valuable a work.

Following this introduction is a short word of explanation by Dr. Mudge, as to the purpose of the book, with a biographical list for those who wish to give the works of the poet more extended study. An ex-

cellent short biography of Browning is next given; then a chapter on "How to Read Browning." This portion of the book would be more satisfactory if the latter subject had received more direct treatment, and if Dr. Mudge had apologized less for the poet's literary faults. But we remember the Philistine, and withhold criticism. After an excellent chapter on the "Benefits of Browning study," the author takes up the work of selection and annotation, to which he devotes 182 pages of the 252 that the volume contains. Here the work is that of the philosopher, theologian and poet, or, the man who sees Browning eye to eye; one who is cosmopolitan in thought and sympathy, poetic in temperament and scholarly in training.

Dr. Mudge is a lecturer in the theological school of the Boston University, and brings no common talent to the work in hand. He gives the reader just the reference that saves an hour's search: a date, a remote fact in history, an outlined argument, a floating segment of doctrine; a touch here and there which makes lucid the mental atmosphere without taxing the memory or burdening the brain.

We heartily commend the book to the lovers of Browning; but more especially do we commend it to the earnest perusal of the thinking Christian.

M. E. RICHARD.

HARPER AND BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Milton's Paradise Lost, with an Introduction and Notes on its Structure and Meaning, by Professor John A. Himes. XXXII-482.

In the past twenty-five years there has been notable progress in the teaching of English literature, and in the preparation of text-books. A generation ago the principal use of our great classics in many schools was to furnish material for parsing and grammatical analysis. This method was succeeded by what may be called the philological abuse. Its birth-place was Germany, whence it was imported into some of our ambitious institutions. The philological crank used the work in hand as the basis of exercises in the history and derivation of words. Both parsing and philology are important, but the study of literature should go far beyond them.

At the present time progressive educators, relegating grammar and philology to a subordinate place, aim at the mastery of a classic as literature, and therefore teach the student to grasp and follow the author's thought in all its fullness. In no other way can a masterpiece minister to the highest culture.

In the preparation of text-books to-day the editors generally take a knowledge of grammar and rhetoric for granted. Their efforts are directed to an elucidation of the text by showing its origin and structure, and in clearing up its historical and mythological references. Philology is introduced only so far as it may throw light on the meaning of the text. There is no other intellectual exercise more valuable and uplift-

ing than thus following the operations of a great mind in the full scope of its workings. The greater the genius and learning of an author, the richer are the results of this painstaking and thorough study.

The object of Professor Himes's edition of *Paradise Lost* is to lead the student and general reader to a clearer and fuller comprehension of Milton's masterpiece. The book before us is not to be classed with the easy, mechanical compilations of which there is no lack; it represents the careful and loving study of years, and presents the conclusions of original thought and investigation. It is a genuine contribution to the store of Miltonic scholarship. Its conclusions are presented with modest confidence; and the scholarly condensation and finish of the introduction and notes are altogether admirable. When the opinions of recognized authorities are controverted, the editor's views are generally presented in a clear, convincing manner.

The text is preceded by an introduction of twenty-two closely printed pages, in which the plan of the poem, Milton's conception of the universe, of the Deity, of man, and of the angels, are presented, and the peculiarities of his style are discussed. This general survey is a model of condensed treatment. In opposition to the common belief, Professor Himes maintains that the general plan of the work is based, not on the story in the first chapters of Genesis, but on the prophet's vision of the seven trumpets in Revelation. Whether we accept this view as clearly established or not, (and there seem to be exegetical difficulties in the way,) it unquestionably has the effect of lifting the whole poem into a more majestic region, and of investing it with grander proportions.

"The designated passage," says Professor Himes, "contains a vision of the judgments attending the entire course of angelic and human transgression. It is a view of the origin, the history and the final overthrow of evil. Its action begins before the creation, takes in the whole reach of time, and ends with the disposition of things for eternity. The scope and purpose of *Paradise Lost* are the same; the sevenfold division of the conflict between good and evil is the same; the separate stages are distinguished by the same features, rapidly sketched by St. John, more minutely drawn and filled up from other portions of Scripture by Milton."

To most readers Milton's conception of the universe is wholly unintelligible. Even so acute a student and critic as Ruskin pronounces the poet's conception of space and locality, vague and indefinite. Professor Himes shows that this charge is unfounded, and that Milton had a clear and consistent, though scarcely scientific, conception of the universe. A diagram, showing the relative location of heaven, hell, and the world or cosmos in the infinite realms of the empyrean and of chaos, makes the poet's conception intelligible almost at a glance. It is needless to say that this explanation adds very greatly to the clearness and sublimity of the poem.

As is well known among theologians, or even among those acquainted with Macaulay's famous essay on the poet, Milton was an Arian. His unorthodoxy would hardly be suspected from the casual reading of *Paradise Lost*, which has in some sense been adopted by the Church as its epic. The poet adheres closely to the language of Scripture. But when attention has been called to his Arian belief, which was clearly stated and strongly defended in his posthumous work entitled *Christian Doctrine*, it is easily recognizable in the poem. "The Messiah", says Professor Himes, in explaining the poet's faith, "seems to bear the same relation to the angels in heaven as he did during his incarnation to men on earth—he reveals to them the mind of God and shares their nature. In him the Father is visible; he has, therefore, a definite form and is a limited or finite being."

The poet's portrayal of our first parents, particularly in their state of innocence, is full of interest. It gives us his ideal of what mankind should be in their physical, mental and moral constitution. It is an ideal of almost matchless beauty. His description of Adam and Eve before the fall exhibits his conception of what the relation of the sexes should be. Whatever harshness may have appeared in the life and prose writings of the Puritan scholar in regard to marriage and divorce, it does not appear in the beautiful visions of the poet. "The free motion of their own minds, the pursuit of their highest enjoyment, secured perfect harmony of action." Let us hope that the world is making its way back to this "statelier Eden."

This admirable edition of Milton's masterpiece suggests many other points of interest, the consideration of which would extend this review too far. The reader is therefore referred to the attractive volume itself, which can hardly fail to give a clearer understanding of the poem, and to awaken a deeper admiration for the poet's mighty genius.

F. V. N. PAINTER.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Old Testament Story. Retold for Young People. By W. H. Bennett, M. A., Hackney and New Colleges, London.

The New Testament Story. Retold for Young People. By W. F. Adeney, M. A., New College, London. 1898. 12mo. 2 volumes. pp. XIV, 200, 204. Price 60 cents each. Cloth.

Though these two volumes are by different authors, their unity of plan is such that they may be considered together. The authors, especially Mr. Bennett, are evidently in sympathy with the results of higher criticism.

The O. T. volume begins with the history of the patriarchs, and carries on the tale to the fall of Jerusalem under Zedekiah. Then the folk-tales of Israel are introduced, giving the cruder accounts of Creation, the Fall, Cain and Able, the Flood and the Tower of Babel.

After this comes the return from exile, called, "The New Israel." This is followed by what the author considers the later folk-tales of Israel, *e. g.*, Creation, as set forth in the first chapter of Genesis, and the longer account of the flood.

The N. T. volume takes the synoptic gospels as a basis, introducing "some stories from John" at the end. After this comes "The Disciples at Jerusalem" and then the "Story of Paul."

The books are very well written, being admirably adapted, by reason of the simplicity of their plan and language, for "the young people;" but it is to be regretted that the authors allowed the simplicity of their plan to be too much in evidence. One misses the familiar faces of some of the Judges, *e. g.*, Samson, and listens in vain for the sound of David's lyre and the voice of a number of the prophets. For similar reasons the N. T. volume also seems incomplete.

The books are well printed and finely illustrated with pictures true to oriental life. The latter cannot fail to be helpful. There is but one fault to find with the work of the printer, and that is the continuous numbering of pages in the two volumes. The first volume also contains the best of illustrations and the table of contents for both volumes.

Altogether the books are a great advance over the moralizing juvenile paraphrases of the Bible with their impossible illustrations. They tend to satisfy a great need, but we await a work of larger scope.

JULIUS F. SEEBACH.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D. Edited by Edwin Charles Dargan, D. D., Professor of Homiletics in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

The first edition of Dr. Broadus's work on Homiletics appeared in 1870. Its success was so phenomenal that in twenty-seven years it passed through twenty-two American and two separate English editions, and was translated into Chinese, and into "Portuguese for the Protestant missions in Brazil."

It has had powerful rivals in the works on the same subject by Kidder, Shedd, Hoppin, Phelps and Fisk. But its sterling common sense, its practical tact, and its wide scope, made it the favorite, so that thousands of copies have been sold. We doubt if any theological student, or preacher, ever read the book without being profited by it, and without being quickened with a sense of the dignity and responsibility of preaching.

In twenty-seven years the science of Homiletics has made great progress. Dr. Broadus, who continued to be a teacher of this science, and a preacher, to the day of his death, kept pace with the progress of his science. The results of his later years of study have been embodied in

this book, by his assistant and successor, Dr. Dargan. The result is that this twenty-third edition is a great improvement on its predecessors.

One of the strong points of this book is the treatment of "The Text." The author not only shows the advantage of having a text, and gives rules for the selection of texts; but he discusses with the thoroughness of an exegete the interpretation of the text. He insists that the preacher who stands up to preach God's Word, is bound to ascertain the *meaning* of God's Word, and has no right to make fanciful or puerile accommodations, based "on mere resemblance;" nor has he any right to say that such and such a passage *might mean* so and so. It is the duty of the preacher, by the use of dictionary, grammar and good commentaries, to ascertain the exact meaning of that portion of the Divine Word which he selects as the text of his sermon. A thoroughgoing application of the principles laid down by Dr. Broadus in this chapter, would result in sounder, stronger and more effective preaching, than is much that is heard from the average pulpit.

Under "the several parts of a sermon," Dr. Broadus treats of Introduction, Discussion, Conclusion. He does not find a place for the Proposition, or Theme, properly so called. We believe this is a defect in the book. With Aristotle we believe that the Proposition is fundamental to discourse. The instinct both of the speaker and the hearer, demands that he who speaks to others for their instruction or edification, should have a distinct proposition, theme, or subject; and we are perfectly sure that time and effort expended in working out and definitely stating the proposition, will be richly rewarded by greater effectiveness in speaking. Well has Prof. Phelps said: "A proposition, and a proposition studied, and often a proposition finished in elaborate and compact form, is a very vital part of pulpit discourse. Though but a fragment in form, it is an index to the whole style of thinking which underlies the form."

In the chapter on *Style*, Dr. Broadus discusses Perspicuity, Energy, and Elegance, with the hand of a master. Under the head of Delivery of Sermons he treats the three methods, viz., Reading, Recitation and Free Delivery, with great judiciousness, weighing carefully the advantages and disadvantages of each method. He greatly favors free delivery, but insists that for this kind of delivery there should be *servent piety* in the speaker, and the most careful arrangement of the discourse. Dr. Broadus is the last man to couple such preaching with carelessness in preparation.

Part V. of the book discusses the "Conduct of Public Worship," and treats of Reading Scripture, Hymns, Public Prayer, Length of Service, Pulpit Decorum, Concluding Remarks. Every Christian, whether minister or layman, High Churchman or Low Churchman, ought to read these discussions. They are not only instructive, but edifying. The dissatisfaction often found with the conduct of public worship is

rightly traced for the most part to "the coldness, lack of animation, want of connection, and general slovenliness which in so many cases mark our worship." In our judgment it is neither the form nor the absence of form that makes worship interesting and edifying. It is the manner in which it is conducted, that determines its power to interest and to edify. From the beginning to the end of a divine service there should be close connection of parts and *progressive* movement. Without these two elements, so frequently ignored alike by the users and the non-users of a liturgical service, *worship* in the congregation is sure to become tedious and unsatisfactory.

We commend the study of this book to every pastor and to every student of theology. As artisans study the latest and best treatises on their several occupations, so ministers should study the latest and best sermons, and the latest and best books on the art of preaching. General reading, exegesis and dogmatics, furnish the materials for preaching; but homiletics teaches the art of arranging and using the materials to the greatest advantage.

The devout spirit that animates this book from beginning to end is not one of the least of its merits. It lays great stress on ministerial character. It closes with the words: "What a preacher *is*, goes far to determine the effect of what he *says*. There is a saying of Augustine, *Cujus vita fulgor, ejus verba tonitrua*,—if a man's life be lightening, his words are thunders."

J. W. RICHARD.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Modern Reader's Bible; the Psalms, Vols. I. and II. By Richard G. Moulton, M. A., Ph. D., Professor of Literature in English in the University of Chicago. Price 50 cts. a volume.

These two little books are a part of a series known as the Modern Reader's Bible, which when finished will make about twenty volumes of about 250 pages each.

These books are not printed in the form usually adopted in the printing of the Bible, but are presented in modern literary form, showing distinction between prose and poetry and in poetry even between the different metrical forms. The mechanical arrangement of this text is by itself of great value in that it aids materially in appreciating the beauty and force of the Psalms and in attaining a better understanding of the thought they contain.

The text in this modernized form is accompanied by an introduction and by explanatory notes which, however, concern themselves almost exclusively with the literary aspects of the Scriptures.

Vol. I. contains an introduction to the whole five books of the Psalms—the text of the first two books—and explanatory notes to the same.

Vol. II. contains the remaining three books of the Psalms and the

book of Lamentations—explanatory notes to these and an index to the whole.

At the beginning of the notes to Vol. I. there are two general notes of great value—on the Metric System of the Psalms and On Direct Metaphor in the Psalms. In the case of well-marked groups such as the Dramatic or Acrostic, the author comments on the whole group in connection with the first example that occurs, and when the same groups are met later on reference is made to these fuller notes.

All the different terms used in designating the various forms of metrical composition are briefly but clearly described, and the form adopted in the different Psalms is pointed out.

Another excellent feature is found in the titles or headings that are given to the chapters, which serve to indicate their general contents to the reader.

There can be no question but that the Psalms read in the form adopted by Prof. Moulton, and examined with the help furnished in his introduction and explanatory notes will become more attractive and interesting as literary productions, and at the same time more helpful for purposes of devotion and for the development of the spiritual life.

E. HUBER.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Her Place Assigned. Walter E. Schuette. pp. 411. \$1.50.

The Secret of the Canyon. Rev. Adam Stump. pp. vii, 347. \$1.25.

These volumes are the John Rung Prize books for 1898. The purpose of that endowment is to stimulate authorship and secure, in time, a model Lutheran Sunday School library. The Publication Society has done itself credit in adding to the prize itself the attraction of such excellent mechanical work as that which we have in these handsome volumes.

The first volume gives the life-story of several members of the "Class of '81, Riverton High School." The history of these young people is designed to show that the "place assigned" for woman is the *home*, and that whenever she steps aside from its duties, even to gain a college education when she would be neglecting no other claim in so doing, she puts an end to her real usefulness and mars the beauty of her life. Helen Doner is a model school girl, a model daughter, a model sister, and perfectly fulfills her mission by becoming a model wife and mother. Her cousin, Corinne Hereford, longs to go to college and has no trouble to secure the consent of her parents. She receives a good education, becomes interested in sociology, and, being a brilliant speaker, addresses large mass-meetings of laborers. While on a visit to her cousin Helen, she is brought painfully to realize that, although she could sway thousands of people in the auditorium, she cannot control rioters in the street, while Helen makes the mob her servants be-

cause one of them recognized in her "the lady as is always been helpin' my neighbor's wife that's been sick all winter." This sets Corinne to thinking, and finally wins her to Christianity and woman's true sphere.

The author's ability to stretch his story to the length imposed by the conditions of competition, is unhappily not equaled by his ability to write good English; and while we cordially commend the author's purpose to put a premium upon woman's devotion to the home, we cannot commend the Publication Society for sending out work done with such evident haste and carelessness. The language is often so inelegant, the descriptions often so incongruous, that we cannot suppress the suspicion that the book was meant to illustrate the warfare which the author wages against higher education for women.

The second volume is "an effort to describe the genesis and evolution of a mission-congregation of the western frontier." It claims to be a narrative, and not a novel. We follow the fortunes of a company of emigrants to the West in the '50's. The familiar faces of good old Pennsylvania families, Scandinavians, Norwegians, *et. al.* make up the party. The settlement, the first encounters with the Indians, the self-sacrificing work of a pioneer missionary, the birth of a western city, the trials of the scattered Lutherans awaiting the establishment of their church, all are vividly told. The romance of the narrative is the search of the pioneer missionary for his two lost sons; and "the secret of the canyon" was their identity with characters that play an important part in the narrative.

Mr. Stump is not a novelist, or he would keep his characters more truly self-consistent; he, too, has fallen a victim to the temptation to expand for the sake of expansion; but, all in all, he has drawn a picture which we shall want to preserve in the history of our church in America, and, although it is not artistically executed, it is true to the original.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Baptismal Regeneration not Taught by the Lutheran Church. By Rev. M. J. Firey, D. D. pp. 92.

The object of this little book is to prove that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is not taught in any branch of the Lutheran Church, but that the doctrine that grace is conferred upon the subject in baptism has taken its place. The author affirms that the objectionable features of Baptismal Regeneration have been laid aside in the latter doctrine, but the name of the first has been retained. The discussion is calm, courteous, and interesting, and numerous familiar authorities are cited in support of the position.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

The Seven Calumnies. A controversy between Father Thomas McGovern, Roman Catholic priest of York, Pa., now Bishop of Harrisburg, Pa., and P. Anstadt, D. D., Editor of Teachers' Journal, etc. Third

revised edition. pp. 94. Price 15 cents post free. P. Anstadt and Sons, York, Pa.

Seven false doctrines and practices are charged against the Roman Catholic Church, viz., Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Salvation by Works, Infallibility of the Popes, Persecutions, Political Intrigues, Papal Bulls and Bible Burnings, which were denounced as Seven Calumnies by Father McGovern. The discussion is thorough and profitable, and sparkles with the wit and humor for which the author is so well known. One closes the book with the feeling that the venerable editor has the best of the argument.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

The Holy Sabbath Day. Its Institution and Obligation together with its Change from the Seventh to the First day of the Week. By Rev. P. Anstadt, D. D. pp. 16. Price five cents a single copy, or \$2.00 a hundred, sent post free.

A timely publication, short and suitable for those who wish to inform themselves fully on the Sabbath question.

T. C. BILLHEIMER

A Plain Guide Post. The Bible Way to Become a Christian. By Rev. Geo. Edw. Faber, M. A., Phoenixville, Pa. pp. 32. Price 5 cents per copy, 50 cents a dozen, \$3.00 a hundred.

The author's aim is to give in the fewest words *the pith of Christianity*. All needless embellishment in the way of figure, historical allusion, or quotation, is omitted. It is just such a book as a pastor would wish to place in the hands of an inquirer.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.